DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 855	CE 029 944
AUTHOR	Gonzalez, Juan C.; Phelps, L. Allen
TITLE	Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs Serving Limited English Proficiency Students. An Analysis of the Illinois Three Phase System.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Adult Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	1 Jul 81
NOTE	161p.; For related documents see CE 029 942 and CE 029 945.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Ability Identification; Administrator Attitudes; Case Studies; Educational Assessment; Educational Diagnosis; Educational Needs; Educational Practices; English (Second Language); *Evaluation Methods; *Language Proficiency; Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; *State Programs; State Surveys; Student Evaluation; Student Needs; Student Placement; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois; *Limited English Speaking

ABSTRACT

A study examined the processes used by the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education in evaluating vocational education programs and services aimed at limited English proficiency (LEP) students in Illinois. Data collection procedures used in the study included the following: (1) participant observation, document analysis, and interviews conducted during three on-site evaluations of local education agencies (LEAs) providing programs and services to LEP students; (2) a questionnaire developed to obtain input from state vocational education directors in seven states regarding current practices of states in evaluating programs for LEP students; (3) interviews conducted with 47 individuals involved with the present on-site evaluation system; and (4) a questionnaire developed to obtain input data from selected LEA personnel, regarding the impact of recent evaluation on programs for LEP students. While most respondents felt that the Illinois evaluation system is accomplishing its goals, many of them also expressed concern about the areas of on-site evaluation methods and the expertise of on-site evaluation team members. (The executive summary of this study and a related study of current practices for identifying, assessing, and placing LEP students in vocational education in Illinois are available separately through ERIC--see note.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206855

EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SERVING LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY STUDENTS
A ANALYSIS OF THE ILLINOIS THREE PHASE SYSTEM

Prepared by:

Juan C. Gonzalez, Principal Investigator
L. Allen Phelps, Project Director
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, Illinois 61820

July, 1981

The project entitled "Research, Evaluation and Program Improvement For Limited English Proficiency Students In Vocational Education," funding agreement number R-32-11-J-2106 was developed pursuant to a funding agreement with the Illinois Office of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777. Opinions expressed in this Technical Report do not reflect, nor should they be construed as policy or opinion of the State Board of Education/Illinois Office of Education or its staff.

CE 029 944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs Serving Limited English Proficiency Students

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ILLINOIS THREE PHASE SYSTEM

Illinois State Board of Education

Donald F. Muirheid,
Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

July 1, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

PRODUCT ABSTRACT iv

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Purpose of Study 5
Statement of Problem 8
Research Questions 9
Definition of Terms. 10
Assumptions. 11
Limitations. 11

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. 12

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES. 28

Overview 28
Population and Sample. 30
Instrumentation and Data Collection. . . 34
Data Analysis. 39

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS 41

Overview 41
Evaluation Procedures of the
Illinois DAVTE 41
Evaluation Procedures of Other
States 59
Critical Views and Concerns. 65
Extent and Nature of the Impact. 71

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS. 93

Overview 93
Discussion and Conclusions 94
Observations and Recommendations 106

REFERENCES 110

APPENDIX 114

A. Questionnaire on Evaluation Practices. 114

B. A Study of the Effects of the Illinois System For Evaluation of Vocational Education Upon the Programs Serving Limited English Speaking Students. 118

C. Three Phase System for State-wide Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs (TPS) 125

D. Evaluation Data Gathering Instruments. 132

VITA 145

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
1. Respondents perception Concerning the Effectiveness of Their Own State's Evaluation Process. 62

2. Respondents Perception Concerning the Need for Improvment of Student and Employer Follow-up Studies of LEP Students. 64

3. Description and Number of Persons Interviewed. . . 66

4. Identification of Those Persons Involved With LEP Students That Were Invited to the On-Site Evaluation Exit Interview 75

5. Identification of Those Persons Involved With LEP Students Who Received the Final Report of the On-Site Evaluation 76

6. Identification of the Extent to Which Persons Involved With LEP Students Were Familiar With the Information Included in the Evaluation Report Concerning LEP Students Programs and Services 77

7. Ratings That During the DAVTE On-Site Evaluation the Respondent's LEA Got Some Ideas on How to Improve the Vocational Education Programs and Services Aimed at LEP students 79

8. Ratings of the DAVTE Evaluation Team Members Knowledge of LEP Programs and Students 80

9. Respondents Ratings on the Awareness and Use of Program Improvement Resources and Services. . 82

10. Ratings on Time Spent by the Evaluation Team on LEP Programs and Services and on Changes Resulting from Information Provided by the On-Site Evaluation Report. 83

Illinois State Board of Education

Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Research and Development Section

Product Abstract

1. Title of material Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs Serving Limited English Proficiency Students (An Analysis of the Illinois Three Phase System)
2. Date material was completed July 31, 1981
3. Please check one: New material _X_ Revised material ___
4. Originating agency University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
   Address 345 College of Education, Champaign, IL Zip Code 61820
5. Name(s) of developer(s) Juan C. Gonzalez, L. Allen Phelps
   Address 345 College of Education, Champaign, IL Zip Code 61820
6. Developed pursuant to Contract Number ST IL OE AVTE R-32-11-J-2106

---

7. Subject Matter (Check only one according to USOE Code):

USOE Code

___ 01 Agricultural Education
___ 03 Business and Office Education
___ 04 Distributive Education
___ 07 Health Occupations Education
___ 09 Home Economics Education
___ 10 Industrial Art Education
___ 16 Technical Education
___ 17 Trade and Industrial Education
___ 22 Cooperative Education
___ Career Education
_X_ Other (Specify) LEP-Special Needs

---

8. Education Level:

___ Pre-K Thru 6
_X_ Post-Secondary
___ Administrator (Pre-Service)
___ 7-8
_X_ Adult
_X_ 9-10
___ Teacher (Pre-service)
___ Other (Specify) ___
_X_ 11-12

---

9. Intended for Use By:

___ Student
_X_ Teacher Educator
___ Other (Specify) ___
_X_ Classroom Teacher
_X_ Guidance Staff
_X_ Local Administrator
_X_ State Personnel

---

10. Student Type:

___ Regular
_X_ Limited English Proficiency
___ Disadvantaged
___ Handicapped
___ Other (Specify) ___

---

11. Medium and Format of Materials:

_X_ HARDCOPY
No. of pages 145
_X_ Paper bound
___ Hard bond
___ Loose-leaf

___ VIDEOTAPE
___ Minutes
___ B & W
___ Color
___ inches

___ FILM
___ Minutes
___ B & W
___ Color
___ mm

___ MICROFICHE
___ B & W
___ Color

Photos: Yes ___ No _X_
Diagrams: Yes ___ No _X_

SLIDES
No. of frames
B & W
Color
Audio
Carousel provided
Other packaging used
(Specify)

FILM STRIPS
No. of frames
B & W
Color
Audio

AUDIO
Automatic synch
Hz
Manual cue
Reel
Cassette
Cartridge

OTHER
Specify:

12. Availability:

One copy free
[✓ In ERIC system] (No.)
For sale @ $ per copy
Not available
[✓ Loan copy available]

Contact: Name Dr. L. Allen Phelps
Phone (217) 333-2325
Address 345 Education Building, 1310 S. 6th
Champaign, IL
Zip Code 61820

13. Copyright Restrictions:

Contact: Name None
Phone ( )
Address
Zip Code

14. Is Training Required for Optimum Use of These Materials? Yes [✓ No]

15. Are Consultive/Training Services Available? [✓ Yes] No

Contact:
Illinois State Board of Education
Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Research and Development Section, E-426
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777
(217) 782-4620

16. General Description (State the general objective and suggested method of use. Summarize the content and tell how it is organized. Continue on back of this sheet or on another sheet, if necessary.):

The purpose of the study was to provide a better understanding of the processes used by the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) in evaluating vocational education programs and services aimed at limited English proficient (LEP) students in Illinois. This was accomplished by developing and portraying a comprehensive picture of the current evaluation process. Included in the body of data were the views and concerns of several groups who are involved in (see attached)

17. Person Completing this Abstract: Juan C. Gonzalez

Full Address:

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
345 Education Building, 1310 S. 6th Street
Champaign, IL
Zip 61820

and affected by the on-site evaluation process for vocational education programs in Illinois. Data, views, concerns, and improvement-oriented recommendations were collected from Team Leaders, Team Members, local administrators, teachers, counselors, students and community members, as well as DAVTE personnel. Responses to a series of four major research questions were sought:

1. What procedures have the DAVTE undertaken in order to evaluate programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
2. What are other states doing in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP populations?
3. What are the views and concerns of the DAVTE staff, local administrators and board members, instructors, students and community members with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
4. What is the extent and nature of the impact on local education agencies that were evaluated in FY 1980 and care serving LEP students?

A variety of procedures were used to collect the data utilized in the study:

1. Participant-observation, document analysis and interviews were conducted while the principal investigator participated in three on-site evaluations of local education agencies providing programs and services to LEP students.
2. A questionnaire was developed to obtain input from state vocational education directors, regarding the current practices of states in evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.
3. Interviews were conducted with 47 individuals to discover and verify the views and concerns regarding the present on-site evaluation system. The interviews included: DAVTE staff, local administrators, instructors, students and community members, i.e., employers parents, Advisory Council members, etc.
4. A questionnaire was developed to obtain input from selected LEA personnel, regarding the impact on programs and services provided to LEP students that were evaluated by the TPS in fiscal year 1980. Follow-up phone and personal interviews were conducted to acquire a further in-depth perspective of the impact. In addition. document analysis was

conducted to consider the composition of the on-site evaluation team, recommendations made by the team, changes in the One and Five Year Plan, and also the number of LEP students being served by the LEA.

The discussion, conclusions and recommendations are included in the executive summary.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Vocational education received its first support from the federal government with the Smith Hughes Act of 1917, which introduced the concepts of "manual arts" and "manual training". Since this federal role started, vocational education has provided skill training to many americans and has prepared individuals for productive careers. This initial federal support did not assure vocational education programs as being readily accessible to the handicapped, the disadvantaged, minorities, women, and those with limited English speaking ability. Since then, however, the social and cultural milieu of America has changed extensively and vocational education has attempted to increase its accessibility by including programs and services designed for persons with special needs.

The first federal legislation to designate persons of limited English proficiency (LEP) was the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) which identified these individuals as a priority target for occupational training. The next major federal legislation was the Education Amendments of 1976, Title II - Vocational Education Act (Public Law 94-482) which consolidated state administrative authority and required the states to develop goals and programs for dealing with LEP populations (U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Office of Education, 1977). In addition, states were required to submit five year plans for vocational education which addressed the needs of this special population (as well as the handicapped and the disadvantaged populations). According to Hurwitz (1980), the

Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) provided the "most definitive statement of support for action in this area" (p. 12).

Public Law 94-482 specifically provides federal dollars for institutions that wish to set up and provide bilingual vocational training to LEP populations. Although federal funds are available for bilingual vocational education consesnsus has not been reached as to the exact meaning and use of the term bilingual vocational education. Hurwitz (1980) in discussing the term bilingual vocational education states the following:

> It has been used in reference to a variety of vocational education programs for those whose native language is other than English. The term is used most precisely in reference to vocational education programs where a portion of the vocational instruction occurs in a language other than English, and were English is also used or taught. Generally these programs include Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL). This English instruction is considered a vital aspect of vocational programs for Limited English speakers, whether or not the program is technically bilingual. (Hurwitz, 1980, p. 15)

The major goal of federally funded bilingual vocational education programs according to the Office of Education are to; 1) help an adult who speaks little or no English to acquire useful vocational skills and 2) learn to speak and understand English well enough to compete successfully in the job market. (U.S. Department of Education, 1979).

Vocational education programs aimed at serving limited English proficiency (LEP) populations are a relatively new educational forum. Traditionally, students who were not proficient in English were not able to participate in vocational education programs. Public Law 94-482 not only identified persons of limited English proficiency as a national priority but also required a set-aside of federal funds at the state level specifically for handicapped, disadvantaged and limited English proficiency students. States are required to set-aside 20 percent of their Federal allotments for vocational education for these special programs and services for the disadvantaged, which included persons of limited English proficiency. Of this 20 percent set-aside, states must use for the LEP target population, a minimum portion of funds equal to the ratio of the population between 15 and 24 years of age with limited English speaking ability to the general population of the same age. Even though these set-aside requirements exists, no current reporting systems indicate the extent to which such populations are served, according to the Report to Congress and the President from the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Labor entitled The Status of Bilingual Vocational Training, Fiscal Year 1977. Since these programs and services are relatively a new approach to meeting the needs of LEP students only a very few states have developed evaluation models and methodologies to meet the demands of these innovative educational programs.

Public Law 94-482 identified the need of LEP individuals as "most acute" (P.L. 94-482, Title II, Part B, Subpart J, Section 181) in regards to vocational training. In Illinois, vocational education programs at the high school, adult education, or community college have provided thousands of students with marketable skills. However, despite these efforts by Illinois, Lopez-Valadez states the following:

> a significant portion of the population remains virtually unserved by such programs. This group consists predominately of persons of limited English-speaking ability (LESA). (Lopez-Valadez, 1979, p. 1)

This statement is verified by the Illinois State Board of Education (Annual Report of the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Fiscal Year 1979) as being one of it's four major concerns. The Annual Report (1979) states the following:

> In some areas of the State, especially in rural and depressed areas, the number and type of vocational education opportunities are significantly limited. As a result, all students within the State do not have equal options for developing skills commensurate with their interests and abilities. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1979, p. 22)

There has been however, a recent effort in Illinois to provide more services and programs to LEP populations. The Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) recently funded a study to review One and Five Year Plans for those districts that had been approved to claim LEP students for 1980. The study revealed that 125 of a possible 750 local education agencies (high schools, area vocational centers, and community colleges) have state-approved One and Five Year Plans for serving LEP students in vocational education. These recent efforts to provide services and programs aimed at LEP students need to be evaluated in order to assure accountability for federal expenditures, as well as future program improvement and growth. The evaluation of these services and programs is being accomplished by the DAVTE through an evaluation system referred to as the Three Phase System (TPS) for Statewide Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs. While various studies have been conducted specifically on the T.P.S. (Norton & Watley, 1972; Smith, 1979; and Cheaney, 1981), it was not known, however, what effects this evaluation system had upon programs and services provided to LEP populations.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of the study was to provide a better understanding of the processes used by the DAVTE in evaluating vocational education programs and services aimed at limited English proficient (LEP) students in Illinois. This was accomplished by providing a comprehensive picture of the current evaluation process. Included in the body of data will be the views and concerns not only of the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) but also those of the local school and community personnel who are involved in or are affected by the evaluation process. Specifically, the study focused on the TPS's effects upon vocational education programs serving (LEP) students in the State of Illinois.

Background and Rationale

This first formal requirement for evaluation of vocational education programs was set forth by the Vocational Education Act of 1964 and its subsequent Amendments of 1968. The Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576) require each state to participate in the planning and evaluation of the vocational education programs within their state. Specifically, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 require each state to form its own State Advisory Council for Vocational Education (SACVE). The SACVEs are responsible for "evaluating vocational programs, services, and activities assisted under the title, and publish and distribute the results" (P.L. 90-576, Section 104 and again reiterated in P.L. 94-482).

A piece of legislation that succeeded the Amendments of 1968 and expanded the formal process of evaluation in vocational education was the Education Amendments of 1976 (Title II, P.L. 94-482). Specifically, the Education Amendments of 1976 require that:

> each state shall, during the five-year period of the state plan, evaluate the effectiveness of each program within the state being assisted with funds available under this act; and the results of these evaluations shall be used to revise the state's programs. (P.L. 94-482, Title II, Section 112)

Under Section 112 of P.L. 94-482 four aspects of local vocational education programs are to be evaluated. They include 1) planning and operational processes, 2) results of student achievement, 3) results of student employment success, and 4) other results as measured by services to special populations. The fourth phase focuses on the results of services provided to the LEP, disadvantaged, handicapped, minorities and women. Even though Section 112 places an emphasis on the evaluation of services provided to special populations, it does not give specific detail on how to accomplish this task.

In 1969, in an attempt to comply with Public Law 90-576 (dealing with the evaluation of vocational programs) the Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education developed a comprehensive procedure referred to as the Three Phase System for Statewide Evaluation of Occupational Educational Programs (TPS). In the State of Illinois the evaluation activities are carried out by the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) and are reviewed by the SACVE. The DAVTE operated the TPS to evaluate all reimbursed vocational education programs (including programs serving LEP students) at least once very five years. A review of the TPS revealed that there were specific guidelines and questions which address themselves directly to programs and services aimed at LEP students, however, the extent to which these elements of the current TPS reflect useful information has not been formally or systematically studied. The extent to which the TPS output information (e.g. final reports) has been used for program improvement relative to LEP students also has not been studied.

There is a need for conceptual and technical development of evaluation procedures which will assist funders, administrators, instructors, students, and community members to better understand the complexities of these new programs and services. While federal legislation and regulations have helped to develop criteria for defining bilingual vocational training, very little is known about the operation of these programs, the instructional practices, and the effects on trainees. An evaluation system should serve to make persons involved in vocational education more aware of LEP issues and concerns. Evaluation activity aimed at evaluating services provided to LEP populations should also serve to increase the awareness and emphasis on LEP students within the local education agency. In addition to obtaining this increased awareness of and emphasis on LEP students, program developers, administrators, instructors and other interested persons need informative program data to assist them in making appropriate changes and improvements in programs and services provided to their LEP populations.

An evaluation of a vocational education program serving LEP students should serve many purposes, and go beyond simple examining services that are currently being provided to students. Such an evaluation should also determine whether the services provided are the ones that are needed by the specific population being served. In addition, it must assess whether the existing services are comprehensive enough to meet the needs of current students as well as potential LEP students. The evaluation results might indicate that certain programs might be improved by adding services, by deleting services for which there is no evident need, or by simply adjusting already existing services to insure that they better serve the needs of LEP students.

A program evaluation which stresses the overall worth of a program has the ability to communicate to others the ultimate successes and payoffs that have been achieved. In addition, while stressing the overall worth of a program, exemplary services and programs can be identified in order to disseminate their practices to other programs. While programs and services for LEP students are relatively limited, enough experience in the field has been accumulated to permit the identification of factors having a prominent effect on program success, and perhaps a definition of at least one of the minimal conditions necessary for a "successful" program or services (Troike, manuscript). The extent to which the TPS addresses and meets these purposes was the focus of the study.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

At this time, little is known concerning the effects of the Illinois TPS upon programs and services provided to LEP populations. Furthermore, little is know concerning the evaluation processes of other states in evaluating these special programs and services. This lack of information is delaying the improvement and further development of evaluation methodologies that will eventually provide decision-makers with reliable and valid data. The absence of such evaluation procedures ostensibly affects both quality and type of programming offered to LEP students.

Undoubtedly, a comprehensive evaluation process would provide a means by which individuals involved in these innovative programs would achieve greater awareness and understanding of the needs of their LEP population. Ultimately, evaluation results would assist in decision-making pertaining to the development, maintenance, and improvement of all vocational education programs serving LEP students. The principal purpose of this study was to examine and develop a more complete understanding of the effects of the TPS upon programs and services provided in vocational education programs throughout the state.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions will assist in the portrayal of different views and concerns related to the evaluation of services and programs aimed at LEP students. Specifically, the questions focus on the evaluation efforts of the DAVTE, concerning the vocational education programs serving LEP students in the State of Illinois. The research questions will include:

1. What procedures has the DAVTE undertaken in order to evaluate programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
2. What are other states doing in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP populations?
3. What are the views and concerns of the DAVTE staff, local administrators and board members, instructors, students and community members with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
4. What is the extent and nature of the impact of TPS on selected local education agencies that were evaluated in FY 1980 and are serving LEP students?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) -- any member of a national origin minority who does not speak and understand the English language in an instructional setting well enough to benefit from vocational studies to the same extent as a student whose primary language is English (Illinois State Board of Education, Rules and Regulations for the Administration of Vocational Programs, 1980). (Note Limited English Speaking Ability (LESA) and LEP were used interchangeably in this study)

English as a Second Language (ESL) -- the teaching of English to persons whose native language is not English.

Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) -- the teaching of special purpose English to LEP/LESA persons which utilizes the vocabulary, situations and lexicon specific to a vocational field or job (Bilingual Vocational Education Project, 1979).

Bilingual Vocational Education -- programs which are designed to enable persons with limited English-speaking ability to acquire the necessary job skills by using two languages as the medium of instruction. An integral part of these programs is the teaching of vocational English as a second language (Bilingual Vocational Education Project, 1979).

Special Needs Students -- an individual who is having difficulty succeeding in a regular or special career-oriented education program due to being disabled, disadvantaged, different linguistic or cultural background and/or dysfunctional school placement, and who requires: (a) individual by prescribed, unique and more powerful teaching techniques; (b) supplemental or supportive services which vary in type and extent depending on individual needs; and (c) additional resources from society for his/her education and for his/her acceptance by society (Phelps, 1976).

ASSUMPTIONS

The study will attempt to provide a better understanding concerning the effects of the Three Phase System upon the programs and services provided to LEP populations. The study will assume that:

1. The data collected through surveys and interviews will be accurate and valid.
2. The data collected will assist in the illumination and identification of the issues and concerns leading to some generalizations.

LIMITATIONS

The study will be conducted under these limitations:

1. The primary investigator has a personal and professional commitment to the continued improvement and growth of programs and services serving LEP populations.
2. The generalizations that can be made from this particular case study to other states are limited because of its own particular contents. The case (or unit of study) which was examined was defined specifically by the nature and characteristics of the Illinois Three Phase System for Evaluating Vocational Education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

OVERVIEW

In order to establish a foundation for understanding and simultaneously viewing the issues related to bilingual vocational education and its evaluation from an overall perspective, it is necessary to review the literature in the following specific areas:

1. The needs of the limited English proficient student in vocational education.
2. The vocational education programs and services aimed at the limited English proficient student.
3. The evaluation of vocational education programs and services aimed at the limited English students.
4. The study of evaluations: meta-evaluation.

Each of these ares are addressed in the following sections.

The needs of the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Student in Vocational Education

The number of limited English speaking persons in the United States has become a major issue in justifying programs, passing legislation and obtaining funds. Public Law 42-482 recognized that a significant amount of the population, (specifically, the LEP population) was not being served by vocational education programs. According to Public Law 94-482:

> "millions of citizens, both children and adults whose efforts to profit from vocational training are severely restricted by their limited English-speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than

> English; (the fact) that such persons are therefore unable to help to fill the critical need for more and better trained personnel in vital occupational categories; and that such persons are unable to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy and must, in fact, suffer the hardships of unemployment or underemployment." (P.L. 94-482, Title II, Part B, Subpart 3, Section 181)

There are at least 28 million persons in the United States, including about 5 million school-age children whose dominant language is other than English. The great majority were born in the United States and are citizens. More specifically, about two-thirds of all these persons and more than four-fifths of the school-age children are native born. This data is drawn from the Survey of Income and Education (SIE), conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Spring, 1976. Other findings provided by the SIE indicated that one persons in eight in the United States had a non-English language background. Furthermore, the specific language background of more than a third of all language minority persons and 60 percent of the school-age children in this group was Spanish. Spanish-language background persons numbered 10.6 million. The SIE data also indicated that language minority persons were located in every State in the Union. However, three out of five were located in five States of the Southwest: Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. These States plus New York, Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey accounted for about 90 percent of the Spanish-language background population. The above SIE data provides for the first time in the U.S. history, individual state estimates of current language usage as well as language backgrounds. It is indeed important that this type of data be collected since, statistics and statistical analysis have become a driving force in social and educational policy-making.

In examining the characteristics of the LEP population in Illinois, one finds that the needs are similar to that of the national population. Illinois is a state with a large population of LEP persons. A study conducted by Lopez-Valadez and Balasubramonian (1978) indicated that Illinois had an estimated 466,721 non-English mother tongue speakers ages 14-24. This number is 19.4 percent of the total number of persons in Illinois ages 14-24. It was projected that this percentage would increase to 21.6 percent by January, 1980. The following data was also drawn from this study:

> 1. Spanish 65.74%, Greek 4.52%, Italian 4.44% and Korean 2.28% are the largest language groups in Illinois.
>
> 2. LESA population estimates in various counties of Illinois indicate that Cook County has the largest concentration of the 14-24 year old LESA population; Champaign, Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, Rock Island, St. Clair, Whiteside, Will and Winnebago Counties each have a thousand or more LESA persons.
>
> 3. Only 13 percent of the 14-24 year old non-English mother tongue population is enrolled in a college or university, and only 14.8 percent of high school students plan to attend a college or university.
>
> Thus, about 72 percent of the 14-24 year old non-English mother tongue population may be in need of vocational education regardless of how much of their mother tongue they use. (Lopez-Valadez & Balasubramonian, 1978, p. 6)

These data vividly demonstrate the need for special vocational programs and services to assist the LESA population in Illinois. According to Workers of Spanish Origin (1978), Illinois in 1978 had a general unemployment rate of 5.4 percent but 8.9 percent for Hispanics. Unemployment is most severe among Hispanic youth ages

16-24. They represented nearly 45 percent of all unemployed Hispanics although they compromise only 26 percent of the total Hispanic labor force (Workers of Spanish Origin, 1978).

The improvement of employment opportunities for persons whose native-language is other than English is a major goal of bilingual vocational education. Lopez-Valadez (1980) states that:

> Despite the fact that traditionally, Hispanics have been tracked into vocational and non-college bound programs, there is a surprising underrepresentation of Hispanics in vocational education programs, in particular at the post-secondary level... This low level of participation by Hispanics can be attributed to the lack of four major elements: access, counseling, programmatic coordination and financial aid. (Lopez-Valadez, 1980, p. 2)

The failure of vocational education to meet the needs of LEP populations necessitates a full commitment on the part of vocational educators to better serve this population. One of the most viable alternatives available to vocational educators is the bilingual vocational education program as proposed by P.L. 42-482. Unfortunately much of what has been done in this area has gone unnotice due to a lack of national research and dissemination efforts. The limited research, development and dissemination efforts according to Phelps (1980), have caused a restricted rate of development and expansion of vocational education programs serving special populations.

The Development of Vocational Education Programs and Services Aimed at LEP Populations

Education Amendments of 1974, Part B (Public Law 93-380), identified persons with limited English speaking ability as a target group for which States were authorized to provide vocational training in coordination with the bilingual education programs (Title VII of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act). This authorization for States to provide vocational training was a commendable approach, however, the States were allowed to set their own priorities for the use of funds with the requirement that they serve the purpose outlined by Congress.

The Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482) provided several changes in regards to programs serving LEP persons. Public Law 94-482 requires the States to consolidate their administrative authority over a variety of types of programs and also required the States to submit annual and 5 year plans for vocational education which include goals and programs for dealing with LEP persons as well as the handicapped and disadvantaged. The allotted funds for each State is described in the following manner by the U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Office of Education:

> The 1976 Amendments specify three groups for whom a portion of the allotted funds to each State must be spend: disadvantaged persons, persons of limited English-speaking ability, and adults. The provisions for "National Priority Programs", Section 110 (b) (1), specify that a State must set-aside each fiscal year at least 20 percent of the State's allotment for vocational education (Section 102(a)) to pay at least half the cost of vocational education for disadvantaged persons and persons with limited English-speaking ability. Each State must use a minimum portion of the 20 percent set-aside for vocational education for persons with limited English-speaking ability. The minimum portion is equal to the ratio of the limited English-speaking population of the State, aged 15-24 (Section 110 (b) (2)). Thus, if 10 percent of the 15- to 24-year-old population in a State has limited English-speaking ability, $2 out of every $100 of the State's allotment for vocational education must be used for persons with limited English-speaking ability. (U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Office of Education, 1977. p. 12)

Congress through legislation (Public Law 94-482) appropriated $2.8 million for bilingual vocational training programs in fiscal years, 1977, 1978, and 1979. Fiscal year 1978 there were 12 bilingual vocational training programs, 3 bilingual vocational instructor programs, and one materials development project.

For FY 1976, the U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Office of Education (1976, p. 12) states that, "States reported Hispanic enrollments as 729,439 or 5 percent of the estimated student population of 14,238,471" that were enrolled in vocational education programs under their auspices. In the specific case of Illinois, of over 670,000 students in vocational education programs only 21,629 are Hispanics, despite a population of nearly 1 million Hispanics. For a recent study funded by the Illinois DAVTE (1980) it was shown that 125 of a possible 750 local districts had been approved to claim LEP students for FY 1980. Of these 127 approved One and Five Year Plans, 120 actually claimed reimbursement for providing services to LEP students for the year 1979-80. The study demonstrated that there were a diversity of services and programs available to LEP students. This diversity of programs and services was shown when the 127 approved programs were reviewed for the types of services provided to LEP students. The coding for services was conducted according to the list of services for "Limited English-Speaking" in the Illinois State Board of Education mimeo handout Occupational Education for Students with Special Needs. From this review process it became evident according to Day and Phelps (forthcoming) that:

> there is an apparent lack of understanding of the importance of bilingual counseling as evidenced by the fact that only 4 of the 125 approved plans provide such counseling. Secondly, there is also a lack of understanding of the importance of VESL as an effective tool for helping LEP students progress more rapidly both in English and in vocational education.

> It would appear that while many districts recognize the need for ESL, few (4 of 125 to be specific) recognize the double-benefit of VESL. (Day and Phelps, forthcoming)

Only four, however, were identified as providing exceptional programming. These exceptional programs specifically mentioned VESL and bilingual counseling as part of their services.

Day and Phelps (forthcoming) identify eight components that are critical in serving LEP students in vocational education. The eight key components are: comprehensive planning, curriculum (reflecting the culture and language of the students), staffing and staff development, assessment and testing, support services, physical facilities, scheduling and flexibility, and program evaluation plans. These areas if used as guideposts in developing programs and services will assure the implementation of a comprehensive vocational education program for LEP students. The recency of this concept of providing services and programs to LEP students requires adaptability and flexibility on the part of vocational educators and administrators. In spite of the limited number of programs funded each year, there can be no single "best" program design, but is should be feasible to draw upon the successful experience of a number of programs. The process of evaluation may assist funders, administrators, instructors, students, and communtiy members to better grasp and understand the complexities of these new programs and services.

The Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs and Services Aimed at Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

> Evaluation is by it's nature a political activity. It serves decision-makers, results in reallocation of resources and legitimizes who gets what. It is intimately implicated in the distribution of basic

> goods in society. It is more than a statement of ideas: it is a social mechanism for distribution, one which aspires to institutional status. (House, 1976, p. 76)

The above quote by House depicts the process of evaluation as a "tool" in deciding who gets what. He goes on to state that "evaluation should not only be true, it should also be just". Justice needs to be an important standard by which evaluations should be judged. The evaluation of vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP populations in particular requires this fair treatment. These services and programs aimed at LEP populations do not represent the typical vocational education program.

Although the literature relating to evaluation theory and research is much richer and more sophisticated today than it was a decade ago, actual results of evaluation studies themselves indicate that from an evaluation perspective, many of the problems posed by the structural as well as the theoretical intricacies of the innovative programs remain unsolved. Guba (1969) commenting on the failure of traditional methods of evaluation states that " Innovations have persisted in education not because of the supporting evidence of evaluation but despite it".

Invariably, decision-makers, educators, evaluators, parents, and the general public have to rationalize the persistent use of evaluation techniques with respect to the "justice" they deliver. The reasoning as to which evaluation technique or methodology to utilize in evaluating programs is a critical factor since the concept of justice limits the approaches one takes, what activities one finds legitimate, what arguments count as significant (House, 1980). The ethics evaluators rely on will effect how they will go about determining program effectiveness and thus future funding. The realization that the evaluation process is a political activity demands that an evaluation not only be true, but also be just (House, 1976).

Bilingual vocational education rightly fits the description of what Cohen (1970) has defined as a "social action" program. Bilingual vocational education meets the necessary criteria of "social action" programs: 1) it aims at improving the quality of education for the disadvantaged populations, 2) it is *not* aimed at improving conditions at one specific site, but rather at directed millions of children and adults, and 3) it has been created and administered by federal and state government and not by any individual administrator or educator. As specified by law, the aim of bilingual vocational education is three fold. Specifically, it should

1. provide the student with English and native language vocational instruction.
2. provide the student with vocational English as a second language instruction while he/she is also learning an occupational skill.
3. facilitate his/her adaptation and participation into the mainstream society. (Hurwitz, 1980)

The first two aims are directed at the fulfillment of the students immediate educational needs and the third related to the students long-term social goal: the attainment of a higher social and economic status.

This type of dual setting just described (i.e. academic and social), is a characteristic which bilingual vocational programs share with many of other social action programs brought in under ESEA. The problems associated with the measurement of success of these programs continues to confound evaluators (Guba, 1969). Vocational education aimed at disadvantaged populations has been particularly troublesome (Korn, 1980). It has most of the problems common to non-ethnically oriented programs-specifically those relating to 1) diversity, obscurity, and conflict within the goals of nation-wide programs, and 2) the lack of clarity regarding measurement framework. Unlike other programs, however, vocational programs aimed at the LEP population confounds all the other difficulties with still another reality - teaching and evaluating in two languages.

Sanchez (1980) indicates that there is a paucity of studies or evaluations concerning bilingual vocational instruction to LEP people. In a study conducted by Sanchez (1980) to analyze selected existing bilingual vocational training programs within the western part of the United States, the data gathered indicated that "program evaluation addresses only outcome variables, i.e., number of graduates, test grades, etc., which measured the students and secondarily reflected program measures." (Sanchez, 1980, p. 197). The study recommended the following:

> Planning for program assessment should being in the development stage and continue into the implemental stage of the program. It should reflect student outcome variables, process variables, and organizational structure variables. Outcome variables relate to graduates, test grades, etc., while process variables reflect such factors as teaching strategies, curriculum planning, and material preparation. Organizational factors include examining the administrative components of the program. (Sanchez, 1980, p. 213)

A two year study of bilingual vocational training is currently being conducted by the Inter-American Research Associates. Specifically, the project is undertaking the study of nine selected bilingual vocational training programs in order to determine program elements and strategies which have successfully contributed to the achievement of program goals. The nine bilingual vocational training programs studied were the following:

China Institute in America, New York City, New York
Chinatown Manpower Institute, New York City, New York
Bronx Community College, Bronx, New York
Miami-Dade Community College, Miami, Florida
SER/Hidalgo Jobs for Progress, San Juan, Texas
El Paso Community College, El Paso, Texas
Little Wound School Board, Kyle, South Dakota
UCLA Dental Assistant Training Program, Los Angeles, California
DeAnza Community College, Sunnyvale, California

According to Troike (manuscript) the study identified ten criteria that would be considered in assessing program success. The criteria serve as a touchstone for administrators and evaluators who desire to initiate or improve vocational training programs for LEP students. The criteria identified are:

1. Job placement rate.
2. Quality of program planning, design, and management.
3. Competence and dedication of staff.
4. Nature and appropriateness of instruction and curriculum.
5. Appropriateness of occupation selected for training.

6. Trainee recruitment and selection.
7. Behavior of trainees, including attendance.
8. Learning rate and achievement levels of trainees.
9. Contextual changes: institutionalization, employer attitudes.
10. Program organization and management.

The Study of Evaluations: Meta-Evaluation

Educational evaluation is a relative newcomer to the field of education. Before 1965 there were few evaluations of educational programs and also little thought given to the necessity of this activity. The evaluation requirement in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and in other federal and state mandates resulted in a great deal of evaluation activity. At the present time, even though a great deal of evaluation activitiy is taking place, there have been relatively few people trained to conduct such work (Anderson & Ball, 1968). Furthermore, there exists today, a widespread lack of agreement about what evaluation is and how evaluation studies should be conducted (Guba, 1969; Wolf, 1979).

According to Stufflebeam (1978), good evaluation requires that evaluation efforts themselves be evaluated. The evaluation of evaluations is needed to both improve ongoing evaluation activities and to assess the merits of completed evaluation efforts. The lable "Meta-Evaluation" first used by Scriven (1969), is typically used to refer to evaluations of evaluation. Meta-evaluation is a concept that is relatively in it's infancy state. It is important not to forget, however, that meta-evaluation is new and is only now learning its mistakes and limitations. The recency of meta-evaluation according to Cook and Gruder (1978), must be kept in its proper perspective. They state the following:

> ... some persons might believe that evaluating evaluations by strictest technical standards is tantamount to treating a developing science as though it were already a developed science with a large stock of accumulated wisdom. Since evaluation researchers caution each other not to evaluate new projects as though they were stable, it would hardly be logical to evaluate the developing art of evaluation in a summative fashion which implied that it was highly developed. (Cook and Gruder, 1978, p. 13)

The state of the art of meta-evaluation is, at its best rudimentary and limited. It must be acknowledged that little can be done to overcome state of the art problems other than to urge evaluators and educators to keep abreast of latest developments in research methodology and substantive theory.

Of particular interest to this study are the actual meta-evaluations that focused on the TPS. The SACVE for Illinois sponsored a study entitled The Efficiency and Efficacy of Evaluation Practices of the Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education by Norton and Watley (1972). The main goal of the study was to determine the performance of the TPS. The study utilized several methodologies:

1. Interviews of division personnel.
2. Sampling of agencies for study.
3. Collection of data from record systems of the division.
4. Submission of questionnaires to planners and team members.
5. Independent study of trends in statewide evaluation (Norton and Watley, 1972, p. 1-2).

The major finding of the study indicated that the TPS was "well received" by educators and noneducators. The study also concluded that the TPS had several deficiencies, "most of which arise from the fact that it does not emphasize or produce product information" (p. 2).

Another meta-evaluation of the on-site evaluation phase of the TPS was conducted by Smith (1979). The main purpose of the study was to provide "a basis for recommendations which could be directed toward the improvement of the on-site evaluation phase" (p. 8). The study employed the following methods:

> 1. Two questionnaires were developed to obtain input from selected LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members after the second on-site visit.
> 2. Selected data of record were obtained from DAVTE to provide measures of student and LEA personnel input at the time of the first and second on-site evaluations.
> 3. The data obtained from the selected LEA personnel, on-site evaluation team members and the data of record were analyzed in response to the research questions formulated for the study. (p. 29)

The study concluded that vocational programs that had received on-site evaluations in 1970 and again in 1975, had to some degree made "improvements in all occupational education components and that the on-site evaluation had contributed to that improvement" (p. 219). In addition, both LEA personnel and team members reported that "Participation in the on-site evaluation was a benefit to themselves and to their LEA occupational education program" (p. 220).

A study conducted by Cheaney (1981), focused on determing the criteria and systems that were used to identify handicapped and disadvantaged students within the local education agencies in Illinois that operate secondary and/or post-secondary vocational education programs. The study did not focus on the effectiveness of the evaluation procedures utulized by the DAVTE, but did have implications for vocational education efforts to identify and serve the handicapped and disadvantaged. The study was able to give specific recommendations on the improvement of criteria and identification procedures that would enhance the LEA's efforts to assess and prescribe needed services for handicapped and disadvantaged students.

These two studies (Norton and Watley, 1972; Smith, 1979) which focused on the improvement of the TPS and the effect the TPS had on the improvement of vocational education programs, did not address the concerns or needs of special needs students in vocational education programs. Indeed, these two meta-evaluations of the TPS have provided the basis for the actual improvement of the TPS and also in the overall quality of vocational education programs in the State of Illinois. However, the continued improvement of the TPS and of vocational education programs throughout the State of Illinois needs to be placed into perspective with regard to the needs of LEP students.

As stated earlier in this chapter, the number of LEP students and their needs have become increasingly recognized within the last few years. In accordance with this recognition, more vocational education programs and services have been aimed at LEP students. The continued growth, improvement and maintenance of these new programs and services aimed at LEP students relies heavily on the evaluation process.

The literature concerning meta-evaluation or evaluations of the TPS do not reflect studies based on the case study methodology. Specifically, the literature revealed that meta-evaluation models and methodologies that are either theoretically proposed or in actual use, are mostly based on empirical data and pre-established criteria and propositions. Meta-evaluations are to be conducted, according to the literature, with decision-makers delineating what the areas of concern are, and what data needs to be gathered in order to make "wise and beneficial" decisions.

A meta-evaluation of the TPS needs to be particularistic, holistic, and qualitative in nature. A case study with its boundaries defined in terms of a: "study providing a better understanding of the process involved in evaluating vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP students in Illinois", may be classified as particularistic or focused. The indepth focus on this topic is justifiable on the basis that it is complex, sensitive and dynamic. A case study approach is viewed as a way to understand the complexity of a situation and its parts. Meta-evaluation models and methodologies do not reflect the case study methodology. As stated earlier, the state of the art of meta-evaluation is, at its best, rudimentary and limited. The recent acceptance of the concept of meta-evaluation and of case study methodologies has limited their individual and collective growth.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

OVERVIEW

The intent of the study was to examine the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education's process of evaluating vocational education programs and services provided to LEP students. More specifically, the focus of the study was to provide a better understanding of the effects that the TPS had upon programs and services provided to LEP students. The study primarily utilized the case study methodology as a means of getting close to the phenomenon under study.

The rationale for utilizing the case study methodology stems from the fact that it requires the evaluator using qualitative methods, to understand the setting under study through direct personnel contact and experience with the particular program. This holistic-inductive approach is based on perspectives developed in phenomenology (Bussis, et al, 1973). The phenomology approach is concerned with understanding human behavior from each persons point of view (Spier, 1980). Phenomonelogist believe that human behavior cannot be understood without understanding the framework within which those being studied interpret their actions, feelings, thoughts, and motives.

Design of the Study

The design examined the effects of the TPS on programs and services aimed at LEP populations through the use of four procedures. The procedures were:

1. Participant-observation, document analysis, and interviews were conducted while the principal investigator participated in three on-site visitations of local education agencies providing programs and services to LEP students.
2. A questionnaire (See Appendix A) was developed to obtain input from state vocational education directors, regarding what other states agencies are doing in evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.
3. Interviews were conducted to discover and verify the views and concerns of the DAVTE staff, local administrators, instructors, students and community members.
4. A questionnaire (See Appendix B) was developed to obtain input from selected LEA personnel, regarding the impact on programs and services provided to LEP students that were evaluated by the TPS in Fiscal Year 1980. Follow-up phone and personal interviews were conducted. In addition, document analyses were conducted to consider the composition of the on-site evaluation team, recommendations made by the team, changes in the One and Five Year Plan, and also the number of LEP students being served by the LEA.

The study collected and utilized both qualitative and quantitative data. Multiple types of data were used in this case study. The use of multiple types of data to study a single problem or program is called triangulation according to Denzin (1978). This triangulation aids in correcting for the biases that are present in each type of data. Furthermore, triangulation acknowledges that evaluations usually have multiple purposes which must be carried out under the most demanding of conditions (Reichardt and Cook, 1979). This variety of needs often requires a variety of methods. Denzin stresses the need for triangulation in the following manner:

> Because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of observations must be employed. This is termed triangulation. I now offer as a final methodological rule the principle that multiple methods should be used in every investigation. (Denzin, 1978, p. 28)

The design was structured to acquire the information most needed and most useful in the given situation. This particular meta-evaluation of the TPS required comprehensive familiarization and understanding of the TPS, needs and concerns of LEP students, possible approaches in providing programs and services to LEP students, issues and concerns of decision-makers, and the socio-political context in which these programs operate.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

On-Site Visitations

The principal investigator participated in three on-site visitations (See Appendix C, which provides overview of the TPS) of LEA's which were providing some programs or services to LEP students. The three sites were selected from a total population of 95 LEA's which were scheduled to receive their on-site visitation (this takes place every five years). In fiscal year 1981, 13 of these 95 LEAs had been approved for claiming reimbursement for serving LEP students. The three sites were selected from this sub-population of 13 LEAs. The selection was based on what Patton (1980, p. 154) has termed "purposeful sampling". In collaboration with the project and the advisory committee, project staff, and the DAVTE staff, consensus was reached concerning the three "typical" sites. The selection was based on the following criteria:

1. Must select at least one of each of the following education agencies: secondary school, area vocational center, and a post-secondary school.
2. Must have a sizeable LEP population in community (as verified by Regional Administrators, DAVTE staff, and advisory committee members).
3. Must have been identified as an LEA currently providing programs and services to LEP students (as verified by analysis of the 13 LEA's One and Five Year Plans for Vocational Education and also verified by the Regional Administrators, DAVTE staff, and project Advisory Committee members).

Questionnaire on Evaluation Practices of Other States

The questionnaire (See Appendix A) concerning the identification of evaluation practices being used to meet the evaluation requirements setforth by Section 112 of Education Amendments Public Law 94-482, was developed, pilot-tested, and mailed to all fifty state directors of vocational education (plus seven territories). The purpose of the questionnaire was to identify the current practices of other state board of vocational education in evaluating programs serving LEP students.

Interviews

In-depth interviews were conducted to discover and verify the views and concerns of a variety of persons. The selection was based on pre-fieldwork information collected at the planning stage of the study. This pre-fieldwork information was collected through the review of relevant literature, recommendations of the Project Advisory Committee and initial contacts and interviews with knowledgeable persons relative to the TPS. Interviews were conducted with the DAVTE staff, on-site visitation team leaders and members, LEA administrators and instructors, and student and community members. Interviews began September 1, 1980 and were completed June 22, 1981. It was assumed, that in view of the time constraints of the study, it was impossible to interview all persons who are involved in or who are affected by the TPS. However, based on information collected on initial contacts, it was possible for the evaluator to be aware of the variations among the sites and personnel. Patton in describing the problem of representativeness states the following:

> By attempting to increase the diversity or variation in the sample, the evaluator will have more confidence in those patterns that merge as common sites while at the same time being able to describe some of the variation that has emerged to make programs unique as they adapt to different settings. (Patton, 1980, p. 102)

The bottom line concerning the selection of interviews, according to Patton is that "evaluators think through what cases they could learn the most from, and those are the cases that are selected for study" (1980, p. 101).

Questionnaire on the Effects of the TPS

The initial population for this questionnaire were all LEAs that were either approved to claim reimbursement or actually did claim reimbursement for providing programs and services to LEP students in Fiscal Year 1980. From this population, a subpopulation of LEAs identified that had received an on-site visitation in Fiscal Year 1980. The 33 qualifying LEA's were divided in the following manner:

LEAs that received an on-site evaluation and also were approved to claim reimbursement for serving LEP students = 27

LEA's that received an on-site evaluation and actually did claim reimbursement for serving LEP students = 6

Total LEA's were either approved or actually did claim reimbursement and also received an on-site evaluation in fiscal year 1980 = 33

The 33 LEA's represented 26 secondary LEA's. Six post-secondary LEA's and two area vocational centers. The vocational education directors of each of these 33 LEAs received a questionnaire. After the questionnaires were returned and analayzed, three LEAs were identified for a further in-depth view. The selection fo these three LEA's was based on the following criteria:

1. Representation of one Area Vocatonal Center, one post-secondary school and one secondary school.
2. A approval by each LEA to participate in further in-depth interviews.
3. A sizeable LEP population exists in the community (as verified by Regional Administrators, local administrators, DAVTE staff and individual Project Advisory Committee members).
4. Identified as an LEA that in Fiscal Year 1980 and in Fiscal Year 1980 and in current Fiscal Year 1981, was providing some programs or services to LEP students (as verified by

analysis of their One and Five Year Plans for Vocational Education and also verified by Regional Administrators, local administrators, DAVTE staff, and individual Project Advisory Committe members).

As part of the further in-depth view, interviews were conducted with the vocational education directors, personnel that dealt directly with LEP students (E.G. instructors, guidance or counseling staff), the on-site visitation team leader, the regional administrators and students. An average of four individuals were interviewed at each site.

INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA COLLECTION

On-Site Visitations and Interviews

The interviews pertaining to the evaluation of services and programs aimed at LEP students in Illinois were phenomenological in nature. The phenomenological approach, according to Patton, is to be used when the:

> interviewer wants to maintain maximum flexibility to be able to pursue information in whatever direction appears to be appropriate, depending on the information that emerges from observing a particular setting or from talking to one or more individuals in that setting. Most of the questions will flow from the immediate context. Thus, the conversational interview is a major tool used in combination with participant observation to permit the evaluator who is participating in some programmatic activity to understand other participants' reactions to what is happening (Patton, 1980, p 199).

As Patton points out in the above quote, exact questions are at times not possible; however, structuring the interviews around issues will assist the researcher in discovering the foci of the inquiry. An issue is a proposition about which people disagree, according to Stake (1979). Stake describes it further:

> It is an idea about which there is an extra tension within dynamic processes. It may be something that calls for watchfulness, needing focus and attention. Whether or not people are arguing about it is not crucial, but an issue is something that is felt deserving of and likely ultimately to be prominent in controversy. (Stake, 1979, p. 2).

Stake (1975) argues in another article that humans are the best instruments for many evaluation issues. The important concern for the evaluator is to get his/her information in sufficient amount from numerous independent and credible sources so that it effectively represents the perceived status of the program, however complex. Issues that were used to structure the interviews were the following:

1. Overall strengths and weaknesses of the on-site visitation process.
2. Changes that might have occurred in programs and services aimed at LEP students as a result of the on-site evaluations.
3. Expertise and composition of team members on an on-site visitation.
4. Changes that might be made in the on-site visitation process with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP students.

Identification of these issues and concerns was conducted through several stages, including initial interviews, initial data analysis, literature review, checking interpretation of interviews with the interviewers, and use of formal questionnaires. The interview data were recorded using field notes. Since it was humanly impossible to write down every action that took place or that was said by informants, field notes were taken in a condensed version. An effort was made to include direct quotes, phrases, single words, and unconnected sentences. After the actual interviews, an expansion of condensed field notes was accomplished. Ideas that seemed to be issues or concerns of major importance to the respondents were numbered sequentially and related topics were also coded with their main-issue number.

Questionnaire on Evaluation Practices of Other States

The questionnaire which was mailed to state vocational education directors was designed to provide some empirical account of how many states have a separate evaluation process for evaluating vocational education programs serving LEP students. More specifically, the intent of the questionnaire was to identify exemplary evaluation practices in other states.

The questionnaire was reviewed by the Project Advisory Committee and was pilot-tested and reviewed by one on-site team leader and the Head of the Program Approval and Evaluation Section of the DAVTE. Data collection of this questionnaire began on November 10, 1980 and continued until April 1, 1981. The time schedule for data collection involved the initial mailing on November 10, 1980 and a follow-up mailing one month after the initial mailing. Those state directors who did not respond to the initial mailing or to the follow-up letter, received a follow-up phone call between January 19 to January 30, 1981. The phone call reminded the respondents of the nature of the study and the importance of their participation in the study.

Items included in the questionnaire were the following:

- -- Does your state have a separate evaluation process for evaluating vocational programs serving LEP students?
- -- Rate this statement; Your state is effective in meeting the requirements setforth by Section 112 (Title II, Education Amendments of 1976) in evaluating all vocational programs.
- -- Rate this statement; Your state is effective in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP students.
- -- Rate this statement; Your state is effective in utilizing evaluation results in improvement of services and programs aimed at LEP students.
- -- Rate this statement; The evaluation efforts in your state need to be revised to meet the needs of LEP students.
- -- Do you feel your state's follow-up studies of LEP students need to be improved? If yes, why?
- -- Do you feel your state's employer follow-up studies of LEP students need to be improved? If yes, why?

Questionnaire on the Effects of the T.P.S.

The questionnaire which was mailed to 33 LEA vocational education directors was designed to provide some quantifiable measures of the effect the on-site visitation had on programs and services provided to LEP students. This questionnaire was developed with the guidance of a questionnaire which had been previously used to assess the TPS (Smith, 1979). The questionnaire used by Smith, was utilized to determine whether any changes in vocational education programs could be related to the on-site evaluation visits which had occurred twice within a five year period.

The questionnaire was reviewed by the Project Advisory Committee and the DAVTE staff. The questionnaire was also pilot-tested with four LEA's. Vocational directors of these four LEA's were asked to pilot-test the questionnaire to determine the suitability of the format (Did the format cause confusion? Was it readily understood?) and item characteristics (Were items easy or too hard? Were items all answered?). Information gained through the review of the questionnaire and the pilot-testing was utilized in developing the final copy of the questionnaire.

The time schedule for the collection involved an initial mailing of April 15, 1981 and two follow-up phone calls at two week intervals. The follow-up phone calls attempted to determine whether the questionnaire had actually been received by the respondents. (In three instances, respondents stated that they had not received the questionnaire. These three respondents were sent a follow-up letter, a second copy of the questionnaire and another return addressed, stamped envelope). The focus of the follow-up phone calls centered on the nature of the study and the importance of their participation in the study. Some of the items included in the questionnaire are the following:

-- Rate cultural sensitivity to LEP students by vocational education instructors.

-- Rate cultural sensitivity to LEP students by guidance and counseling personnel.

-- Rate staff development concerning issues and concerns of LEP students in vocational education programs and services.

-- Rate the statement; To the best of my knowledge the DAVTE evaluation team members who interviewed our LEA were knowledgeable in the area of LEP students.

-- Rate the statement; Through the on-site evaluation, our LEA became aware of resources and services that will/ are being used to improve programs and services for LEP students.

-- Rate the statement; Many of the changes that will/are being made in our vocational education programs and services for LEP students have been the result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report.

DATA ANALYSIS

Questionnaires

The analyses of both questionnaires, required for the purpose of this study, included the computation of descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were used for summarizing data systematically for ease of comprehension. Attempts to make broad generalizations and interpretations are not to be attempted with the data. The empirical measurement of key aspects related to the study will assist the principal evaluator in gaining a different perspective which will complement the qualitative data collected. The empirical data aided in the discovery and verification task of the principal investigator.

On-Site Visitations and Interviews

According to Spirer, the phenomenological approach to data analysis is continuous:

> Analysis of case study data is an ongoing process that begins as soon as the first piece of datum is collected. This feature, i.e., "analysis as you go," distinguishes the case study form other methodologies in which data collection and data analysis are discrete activities. (Spirer, 1980, p. 61)

As data was collected and immediately analyzed, inferences were drawn, new questions raised, and themes developed which adjusted the focus and schedule of the interviews and observations (Spirer, 1980). Data analysis involved the making of patterns, themes, and categories for the data. The divisions emerged out of the data rather than that of imposed divisions placed on them prior to data collection.

The process for constructing the case study is the process proposed by Patton:

> Step One: Assemble the raw data.
> This data consist of all the information collected about the person or program for which a case study is to be written.
>
> Step Two: Construct a case record.
> This is a condensation of the raw case data organizing, classifying, and editing the raw case data into a manageable and accessible package.
>
> Step Three: Write a case study narrative.
> The case study is a readable, descriptive picture of a person or program making accessible to the reader all the information necessary to understand the person or program... The case study presents a holistic portrayal of a person or a program.
> (Patton, 1980, p. 304)

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this study was to provide a better understanding of the processes used by the DAVTE in evaluating vocational education programs and services designed to serve limited English proficiency students in Illinois. Specifically, the study focused on the TPS's effects upon vocational education programs serving LEP students in the state of Illinois. This chapter presents the results of this study. The organization and presentation of the data will follow the major four research questions for the study:

1. What procedures has the DAVTE undertaken in order to evaluate programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
2. What are other states doing in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP populations?
3. What are the views and concerns of the DAVTE staff, local administrators and board members, instructors, students and community members with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
4. What is the extent and nature of the impact on local education agencies that were evaluated in FY 1980 and are serving LEP students?

EVALUATION PROCEDURES OF THE ILLINOIS DAVTE

The Illinois State Board of Education (DAVTE) developed and implemented a formal planning and evaluation system to insure the maintenance growth and quality of all vocational education programs and services. In order to fully understand the procedures of the TPS several types of data were collected. Data were collected through participant-observation in three actual on-site visitations and in the Team Leader Orientation Session held in early Fall of 1980, and also in the Team Leader Wrap-up held in late Spring of 1981. Data were also collected through the review of significant documents. Documents reviewed were the following:

1. Rules and Regulations for the Administration of Vocational Programs; Illinois State Board of Education.
2. Vocational Education Data System Report for 1979-80; Illinois State Board of Education.
3. Guidelines and Format for Local District One and Five Year Plan for Vocational Education; Illinois State Board of Education, FY 1980-81.
4. Team Member Handbook; Illinois State Board of Education, 1980-81.
5. Team Leader Handbook; Illinois State Board of Education, FY 1980-81
6. Evaluation data gathering instruments (See Appendix D)
    A. Student and Faculty, Preliminary Evaluation Instrument.
    B. School and Community Data Form.
    C. Team Leader Questionnaire.
    D. Student and Employer Follow-Up.

In addition to the participant-observation and document review, data were also collected via interviews with team members, team leaders and staff from the DAVTE. There interviews were extremely helpful in better understanding the intricate and complex segments of the entire TPS.

As a result of reviewing documents related to the TPS, it is clear that the intent of the system is quite broad in scope. The comprehensiveness of the TPS is described in Appendix C. Readers are encouraged to read the material in Appendix C, (which describes the current 1980-81 TPS) prior to reading further.

Evaluation Data Pertaining to LEP Students in the TPS

In reviewing these instruments, it is evident that some data is collected with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP studetns. The Faculty PEI accumulates more specific data concerning LEP students than all of the other instruments. The Faculty PEI has a total of 27 response items. Of these 27 items, four items provide specific data regarding LEP programs and services. The four items are the following:

Item 14. Does your Agency have a system for identifying disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English Proficiency students?

_____Yes _____No

Item 15. Do you have students in your class(es) who are:

a. Disadvantaged?

_____Yes _____No _____Uncertain

b. Limited in English proficiency?

_____Yes _____No _____Uncertain

c. Handicapped?

_____Yes _____No _____Uncertain

Item 16. Are additional services provided by your agency for disadvantaged, limited English proficiency and handicapped students (other than special education)?

a. Disadvantaged?

______Yes ______No ______Uncertain

b. Limited in English proficiency?

______Yes ______No ______Uncertain

c. Handicapped?

______Yes ______No ______Uncertain

Item 26. Have you participated in vocational in-service activities which emphasized equal educational opportunity for all students?

______Yes ______No

These four Faculty PEI items are used as a major source of data in addressing the Tasks in the Team Member Handbook which address LEP issues. The Student PEI does not provide any information relevant to this issue. However, one must consider if the student PEI could be completed at all by students with a limited English proficiency ability.

The Team Member Handbook provides the team members with three specific Interview Tasks related to LEP programs and services. The first interview task is found in the Student Services section:

Task 4. Determine the appropriateness of the criteria used to identify disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English proficiency students and the impact of additional services provided to these students.

(PEI Faculty 14)
(PEI Faculty 15)
(PEI Faculty 16)

The next two interview tasks are identified as "Access and Equity" Tasks under the Program Management Section:

Task 1. Determine the adequacy of agency efforts to assure access for all students, including those with special needs, to all vocational education programs and services.

(PEI Faculty 15)

(PEI Faculty 16)

Task 2. Determine if the agency's vocational programs and student services are free of sex bias/sex role stereotyping and cultural differences.

(PEI Faculty 26)

The School and Community Data Form which is filled out by the local One and Five Year Plan writer has one item (which is identical to the prior interview task just presented). Both of these items, in particular, ask if vocational programs and services are free of cultural differences. However, in providing programs and services to LEP students, cultural differences many times could be encouraged and an emphasis placed on sensitivity by faculty and students toward cross-cultural differences.

The Student Processing Unit Record (SPUR) is a data form used by LEA's to record individual student background information along with the results of the student and employer follow-up surveys. LEA's are required to complete a SPUR for every student that has received vocational education training and has completed or left the program. LEA's compile the SPUR's for all students and submit them to the DAVTE. The DAVTE utilizes the SPUR data to produce Team Leader Follow-up Reports for LEA's that are being evaluated.

The SPUR includes two items from the student's background which provide vital information concerning the success of LEP students. The items indicate the students racial/ethnic designation and also classifies special needs students into three categories:

(1) Handicapped, (2) Limited English Speaking, and (3) Disadvantaged. The Team Leader Follow-up Reports, however, do not present data that reflect student racial/ethnic background or special needs classification. This type of data is not provided to the team members or Team Leaders in any other format or content, unless specifically discussed in interviews with LEA personnel.

Data from Participation-Observation in Three On-Site Evaluations

Information gained through participating in three on-site visitations provided an opportunity to discover and verify different themes, issues and concerns relevant to evaluating LEP programs and services. This activity provided a natural setting to gain direct experience in evaluating all aspects of vocational education programs. The complexities of evaluating an entire LEA program became vividly apparent. The role of the principal investigator during three visitations was to actively participate in the evaluation process and to observe and collect data on the actual process itself. The team members and leader were made aware of the principal investigator's role prior to the start of the on-site evaluation. An attempt was made to collect insights in a natural setting while collecting data in an open overt manner.

In the majority of instances team members, leaders, and LEA personnel appeared to be at ease and comfortable with the participation of the principal investigator. Opinions, views, and concerns were readily furnished by participants of the on-site visitation. Most persons were eager to ask questions or give statements of the following character:

> "What type of services should be provided to this kind (LEP) of students?" (Team Member)
>
> "In situations where you have a group of Indo-chinese just drop into your school, how are you suppose to provide vocational training if they cannot speak any English at all?" (Team Member)
>
> "I'm a counselor at my school (Secondary), but I would not know what type of questions to ask of counseling departments, to see if they were meeting the needs of LEP students. I suppose, I do not know what to look for." (Team Member)

The three on-site visitations were conducted at distinctly different LEA's. Each LEA provided, within their own context, distinct approaches in meeting the needs of LEP students. A description of each of the LEA's will follow.

The LEA which provided the most diverse programs and services to LEP students was an urban communtiy college with an enrollment of 5,637 students in the Fall, 1980. The student body reflected a number of ethnic groups. The neighborhood of this community reflects the most ethnically diverse center of urban poverty in the United States according to the LEA's One and Five Year Plan for Vocational Education. The ethnic background of the student population for the Fall of 1980 was as follows:

Ethnic Background	No.	%
Asian	1,124	19.9
Native American	149	2.6
Black	1,079	19.1
Hispanic	836	14.8
White	1,969	34.9
Refuse to Indicate	480	8.5
Total	5,637	99.8

This urban community college along with it's multi-ethnic neighborhoods provided a multiplicity of programs and services to meet their needs. These include:

1. English As A Second Language Program.
2. Tutorial Project.
3. Language Skills Center.
4. Mastery Learning in Courses and Disciplines.
5. Mastery Learning Retention Project.
6. Adult Pre-Entry Program.
7. Plato Center (computer assisted learning center).
8. Vocational English As A Second Language.
9. Bilingual Vocational Center.
10. Native American Vocational Training Program.
11. Russian Refugee Program.
12. Indochinese Refugee Program.

The team leader for this evaluation was a Dean at a suburban community college. The Team Leader had extensive experience in vocational education and in prior evaluation work. In discussing the needs of LEP students with the Team Leader it was evident she held a clear understanding of LEP students needs and how to meet those needs. The team members as a group appeared to reflect a sensitivity to LEP student needs, but some seemed unaware of appropriate strategies to meet those needs.

The evaluation report contained four conclusions with particular impact on LEP student programs or services. They were the following:

Conclusion:

1. Based on interviews with administrators, ______college is to be commended for placing the directors of the following programs in the regular college budget: Bilingual Vocational Program, Russian Refugee Program, and the Tutorial Assistance Program.

Recommendation:

1. Continue and expand institutionalization of other programs serving special needs students.

Conclusion:

2. Based upon the faculty PEI and interviews with members of the college community, the criteria used to identify disadvantaged, handicapped, and limited English proficiency students and special services to assist these students are widely known and utilized.

Recommendation:

2. No recommendation.

Conclusion:

3. Based on the student and faculty PEI data, and interviews with administrators, faculty, and students, _____ college is to be commended for meeting the needs of the LEP students through various approaches including: ESL, VESL, Tutorial Assistance, language skills instruction, Plato instruction, Bilingual Vocational Program, Native-American Program, Russian Refugee Program and the Indochinese Refugee Program.

Recommendation:

3. Continue these fine efforts and expand as appropriate.

Conclusion:

4. Based on the review of the One and Five Year Plan Update, and interviews with administrators, the Bilingual Vocational Center is a worthy and commendable program which meets the needs of LEP students at _______ college. The program is being supported and assisted in its development by administrators, faculty and community members.

Recommendation:

4. Continue and expand the worthy and commendable program.

Suggested Improvements:

4a. Consider renaming the program to reflect its actual bilingual support services and not simply bilingual instruction. A possible name could be "The Bilingual Assistance Vocational Center".

b. Consider expanding offerings to other vocational areas.

c. Consider hiring one full-time job developer.

d. Consider expanding enrollment to more LEP students.

e. Expand the communication of availability of support services to all eligible students.

The suburban community college had an enrollment of 6,000 students in the Fall of 1980. The college itself is located in a small rural town with an approximate population of 1,500 persons. However, the community college serves a Chicago suburban community of approximately 90,000. Within this context, information gained through interviews suggested that approximately 20 to 22% of this population is Hispanic, and about 7% is Black.

The services provided according to their One and Five Year Plan include an English as a Second Language program, a Vocational English as a Second Language program funded under a federal grant, and a project designed to develop and compare two vocational education programs for LEP students, funded under the DAVTE (Research and Development Section).

The team leader for this evaluation held a position as an associate professor at a major state university. He had extensive experience in conducting vocational education research and evaluation of vocational education programs. Through many years of participating as a team leader in the TPS, this team leader had a indepth historial perspective into the development of the TPS. This past experience with the TPS clearly gave him a sensitivity to LEP student needs and also in meeting the needs. In addition to this, he appreciated the difficulty in attempting to, as he stated: "How can you evaluate these (LEP) programs when the system (TPS) was not designed to evaluate in such detail".

The team members on this on-site visitation did have members which were sensitive to LEP needs, but were not experienced in dealing with or providing services to LEP students. The evaluation report contained three conclusions with particular impact on LEP student programs or services. They were the following:

Conclusion:

1. Based upon interviews with faculty and administrators, it is evident that remedial reading, writing and math courses are available to handicapped, disadvantaged and Limited

English Proficiency (LEP) students. Rehabilitation Services (RSA), ______ Hearing Impaired Program (HIP), ESL, and bilingual vocational program student benefit from a comprehensive range of services which should be available and articulated to other handicapped, disadvantaged and LEP students who may need them.

Recommendation:

Continue to provide special services and expand them for other students with special needs.

Suggested Improvements:

1a. Continue to provide supportive services which are currently available.

b. Communicate to handicapped, disadvantaged and LEP students not enrolled in special programs, the availability of existing support services.

c. Assess the need, for additional services.

d. Provide additional support services on an "as needed" basis.

Conclusion:

2. Criteria for identifying handicapped, disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency students is evident in the One and Five Year Plan. However, no central clearinghouse is currently available to deliver support services to those students who may require them.

Recommendation:

2. Develop a means of coordinating the delivery of special services to students in need.

Suggested Improvements:

2a. Conduct a systematic follow-up in regard to the delivery of support services to those students identified as LEP, handicapped and/or disadvantaged.

b. Provide appropriate support services for each student identified.

c. Assign a staff member responsibility for coordinating the delivery of the support services.

d. Communicate the availability of support services to all students.

Conclusion:

3. According to observations and interviews with administrators, faculty, and community members, the LEP student vocational program is a worthy and commendable approach by the college to meet the needs of LEP students. The program is being supported and assisted in its development by administrators, faculty and community members.

Recommendation:

3. Continue the LEP student vocational program.

Suggested Improvements:

3a. Discuss ways to keep this program ongoing.

b. Expand the number of programs available to LEP students.

c. Increase the number of students enrolled in this type of program.

The suburban secondary school is part of one of the largest school districts in the state of Illinois. There are eight secondary schools within this district. The district serves the northwest suburbs of Chicago. According to interviews with the LEA personnel, a sizeable LEP population does not exist in the district. However, interviews with community members reflected that there was a sizeable increase of Hispanics, European immigrants and Indochinese immigrants.

The services provided to LEP students according to their One and Five Year Plan include a building speech therapist who works with students one on one, and a bilingual program designed to help students who possess limited English speaking abilities.

The team leader evaluating this secondary school held a position as an assistant professor at a major state university. She had extensive experience in disseminating information on how to better serve special needs students in vocational education and was currently participating in her 2nd year as a Team Leader. Professional experience included directorship of a project which identified exemplary vocational education programs and services meeting the needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students. In addition to this, she was actively involved in numerous dissemination and in-service activities focusing on how to better serve special needs students in vocational education programs.

Various team members as in the previous on-site visitations were sensitive to LEP student needs but were not experienced in dealing with or in providing services to them. The evaluation report contained two conclusions with particular impact on LEP student programs and services. They were the following:

Conclusion:

1. It was evident that ______ High School does provide additional services through the following programs: EMH, LE, IR and WECEP. However, it was found that vocational instructors need to modify program objectives, teaching methods, and materials to meet the individual needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Recommendation:

1. Efforts should be initiated to encourage vocational instructors to modify and supplement program objectives, teaching methods and materials to meet the individual needs of special needs students.

Suggested Improvements

1a. Provide in-service training for vocational instructors on how to modify and supplement program objectives, teaching methods and materials to better meet the needs of special needs students.

b. Utilize consultants to assist vocational instructors on a regular basis.

c. Utilize State Board special needs consultants and materials relevant to this topic.

d. Establish a procedure or mechanism to assure that the needs of the students are being met.

e. Evaluate ongoing efforts, and generate reports for future services needs.

Conclusion:

2. Based on interviews with instructors guidance staff, administrators and students, it was evident that limited English proficiency students are not participating fully in vocational education programs and services.

Recommendation:

2. Efforts should be initiated to encourage limited English proficiency students to participate in vocational education programs when appropriate.

Suggested Improvements:

2a. Consider the establishment of a bilingual vocational education program.

b. Utilize State Board staff and materials concerning these students.

c. Contact the Bilingual Vocational Education Project in Arlington Heights for assistance in identifying possible alternatives in serving LEP students.

d. Determine the feasibility of establishing a Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) program.

e. Encourage collaboration between vocational instructors and bilingual education instructors to develop strategies on how to modify and adapt program objectives, teaching methods and materials to meet the needs of LEP students.

f. Recruit a Hispanic community member on the advisory council.

In retrospect, the opportunity to participate and observe three separate on-site visitations provided much meaningful information. Probably the most powerful observation was the reaction of the team members to the entire process. The positive feelings regarding the rapid setting bonds of teamwork, cohesiveness and cooperation were common in the three teams. Team members sensed the entire activity as being useful both for the LEA being evaluated and for themselves. Their perspectives on the final evaluation report were of the following nature:

> "The report has addressed every aspect relating to voc. ed., it's amazing how in two days we could have learned so much about this school" (team member)
>
> "It (the final report) is comprehensive and more important, it's going to be read. When our school was evaluated, all of us (instructors) got a copy." (team member)

Team members also expressed views concerning the benefits for the team members themselves. The opportunity to see what other LEA's were doing in their related fields, and also the opportunity to exchange ideas among other team members and LEA personnel was viewed as a "terrific opportunity to grow and meet new people" (team member). In addition, they viewed the experience as helpful in preparing for and gearing-up for their own LEA evaluations. The opportunity to become involved in an actual evaluation and to know in advance what "evaluators" are focusing on, was considered a distinct advantage if their LEA was scheduled for an on-site visitation in the near future.

In the process of the on-site visitations, team members expressed a quandary as to what to look for, or what to ask LEA personnel in relation to LEP programs and services. An interview task under the Student Services section in the Team Member Handbook specifically focuses on the appropriateness of identification criteria and the impact additional services to LEP students. However, little information is given in the PEI's and other evaluation instruments. A team member expressed the following: "The interview task is specific enough, but how do we (team members) know what is appropriate criteria or what is an appropriate or good impact". Most team members which had LEP students in their own LEA's noted that there seemed to be a clear shortage of information on "how to" serve LEP students in vocational education.

When team members were asked the following question: "Do you feel the on-site evaluation process needs to be changed with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP students?", the typical response was: "There probably needs to be more emphasis placed on LEP students, but I wouldn't know what exactly to change" (team member). Very few structural or process changes were recommended by team members. The general perception observed was that team members felt uncomfortable evaluating such programs or services based on their past professional experience which generally appears to be very limited relative to programs and services for LEP students in vocational education.

The role of the principal investigator as a team member and a data collector for a separate study was a difficult task; Team leaders and members identified the principal investigator as an "expert" in LEP students. In line with this "expertise" came primary responsibility of writting conclusions, recommendations, and suggested improvements dealing with such topics as student services, and special needs student issues. In addition to this, a substantial amount of informal inservice activity took place with fellow team members and LEP personnel that were interviewed regarding how to identify and serve LEP students. These activities took place in the midst of attempting to gain a true holistic view of the entire vocational education program.

EVALUTION PROCEDURES OF OTHER STATES

Questionnaires were sent to state vocational education directors of forty-nine states (excluding Illinois) and the following United State districts or territories: District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, Mariana Islands, North Mariana Islands, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. Data were obtained from forty-one states and four territories which represented a total of 45 responses. Additional data were also obtained from state education agency (SEA) personnel by a follow-up phone interview.

Of the forty-five responses, three SEA's did return the questionnaire but did not complete it. Two of these three no response questionnaires explained their no response by this type of statement: "We have no programs for LEP students, therefore, no evaluation process" (State Director of Vocational Education). The other no response questionnaire stated that the entire evaluation system was being revised and therefore did not feel participation in the study would be helpful.

In order to determine whether states had a separate evaluation process for evaluating vocational education programs serving LEP students (separate from regular vocational education evaluation or other state evaluation systems) respondents were asked to indicate positively if they did have a separate process or negatively if they did not. If the answer was YES, repondents were asked to provide a brief description of their evaluation process. The responses were as follows:

States responding "YES"	1	(2.2%)
States responding "NO"	41	(91.1%)
No Response	3	(6.6%)

It should be noted that the one response which answered YES, did provide a brief description:

> Projects funded with LEP funds must submit a Disadvantaged project application if the project is for instruction. These applications specify an evaluation plan separate from regular program review measures.

The data indicated that 91.11 percent of the respondents did not have a separate evaluation process. Some respondents did provide explanations for their response:

> We are interested in learning from other states how they are coping with the influx of LEP people who need vocational training, I would like to prefer to accept the opprobrium and request your help. Does anyone have program guidelines, standards, criteria for evaluation for vocational programs serving LEP (State Program Consultant for Special Needs Programs).

> Our state at present has no specifically identified vocational programs for LEP students. This is limited to the limited population scattered throughout the state (Assistant Director, Division of Vocational and Technical Education).

> In _______, we only have one LESA (limited English Speaking ability) project operational at this time (State Coordinator of Vocational Education).

> We have not had a request for funds and efforts to seek LEP Clients enrolled in vocational education produces nothing (State Director of Vocational Education).

Respondents were asked to agree or disagree to four questions in the questionnaire. Table 1 summarizes information regarding the respondents perception concerning the effectiveness of their own evaluation process.

More than 80% respondents indicated an "agreement" or "strong agreement", in the effectiveness of their state in meeting the requirements set forth by Section 112 in evaluating all vocational education programs. However, a considerable decrease in this feeling is noted, (46.6%) in assessing the effectiveness of their state in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP students. Over one-third, (37.7%) of the respondents were neutral with respect to effectively evaluating LEP programs and services.

Exactly 33.33% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their state was effective in utilizing evaluation results in improvement of services and programs aimed at LEP students. However, the same question elicited a neutral response of 44.4%.

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the evaluation efforts in their state needed to be revised to meet the needs of LEP students. Over 22% of the respondents indicated neutrality to the same question, while one-third disagreed for the need of revisions to their evaluation efforts.

In order to determine whether the respondents felt their own state's student and employer follow-up studies of LEP students needed to be improved, respondents were asked to indicate positively if they did feel a need for improvement or negatively if they did not perceive a need for improvement. If the answer was YES, respondents

TABLE 1

Respondents Perception Concerning the Effectiveness of Their Own State's Evaluation Process

	Question	Response Opinion	Frequency	%
*2	Your state is effective in meeting the requirements set forth by Section 112 (Title II Education Amendments of 1976) in evaluating all vocational education programs.	Strongly Agree	12	26.6
		Agree	26	57.7
		Neutral	3	6.6
		Disagree	1	2.2
		Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		No Response	3	6.6
*3	Your state is effective in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP students.	Strongly Agree	3	6.6
		Agree	18	40.0
		Neutral	17	37.7
		Disagree	4	8.8
		Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		No Response	3	6.6
*4	Your state is effective in utilizing evaluation results in improvement of services and programs aimed at LEP students.	Strongly Agree	1	2.2
		Agree	14	31.1
		Neutral	20	44.4
		Disagree	7	15.5
		Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		No Response	3	6.6
*5	The evaluation efforts in your state need to be revised to meet the needs of LEP students.	Strongly Agree	4	8.8
		Agree	13	28.8
		Neutral	10	22.2
		Disagree	15	33.3
		Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
		No Response	3	6.6

* Numbers correspond to question numbers on Questionnaire on Evaluation Practices.

were asked to provide a brief description of the improvements they felt necessary. Table two presents the results to this question.

Respondents did provide some explanations for their response:

> They (LEP students) would be a part of the overall excellent follow-up system we have in place, since they would be enrolled in an instructional vocational education program (State personnel in vocational education).
>
> VEDS follow-up should key the LEP student/employer responses separately and develop a separate report for these students only (State vocational consultant).
>
> One, three, and five year follow-up procedures to determine, type of employment, salary levels and present status of feelings toward prior vocational services (State personnel in vocational education).
>
> Since there are not follow-up studies at this time, anything would be an improvement (State consultant in vocational education).
>
> An evaluation designed specifically for LEP students. Because the number of LEP students is small, 500+ statewide, not much attention was given in the past to evaluation. However, more emphasis should be given as is to disadvantaged and handicapped students evaluation (State personnel in vocational education).
>
> We would need to know how the business community relates to people (LEP students) that have been trained in vocational and related to specific job task English. Socially our students going through vocational English as a second language still lack the social skills and ESL in social situations. This relates more to culture shock and cultural awareness (State consultant in vocational education).
>
> We need to get a higher return of student follow-up studies. The follow-up survey is being revised to help meet this need (State Director of vocational education).

Respondents were asked in item number eight in the questionnaire, to send material or literature that described their state's evaluation process or that supplemented their answers in the questionnaire. Ten states, 22.22% did send materials describing their evaluation process or vocational programs. Eight of the states sending materials

TABLE 2

Respondents Perception Concerning the Need for Improvement of Student and Employer Follow-up Studies of LEP Students

Question	Percent of Total Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
*6 Do you feel your state's follow-up studies of LEP students need to be improved?	20	44.4	19	42.2	6	13.3
*7 Do you feel your state's employer follow-up studies of LEP students need to be improved?	17	37.7	22	48.8	6	13.3

* Numbers correspond to question numbers on Questionnaire on Evaluation Practices

appeared to utilize both self-study and on-site procedures for the evaluation of vocational education programs. The self-study procedures were used as a preparatory state for the on-site team visit. Data collected in the described procedures rarely surpassed the basic information needed for identifying LEP students for reimbursement purposes or for meeting data requirements of the VEDS forms.

CRITICAL VIEWS AND CONCERNS

Informal and formal interviews were conducted with a variety of individuals. Persons interviewed were staff at the DAVTE, members of the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education (SACVE), local administrators, local instructors, local guidance and counseling personnel, students and community members. The description and number breakdown of the persons interviewed is presented in Table 3.

The total number of interview held with different individuals totaled forty-seven (47). Some persons were interviewed more than once for the purpose of amplification, clarification, or verification of themes and issues. The interviews were phenomenological in nature as described in Chapter Three. The analysis was an ongoing process. The data were analyzed immediately, and inferences drawn, new questions raised, and themes (issues) were identified which adjusted the focus and intensity of future interviews and observations.

The presentation of data will be divided into the four main themes. These four themes were identified by the interviewees as being major issues or concerns relavent to the evaluation of voca-

TABLE 3

Description and Number of Persons Interviewed

Description	Number of Persons
Members of State Advisory Council for Vocational Education (SACVE)	2
Staff at the Department of Adult, vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE)	4
Team Leaders	6
Team Members	6
Administrators	6
Instructors	7
Guidance and Counseling Personnel	5
LEP Students (enrolled in vocational training)	6
Community Members	5

tional education programs serving LEP students. It should be noted that the interviewer was not attempting to generate standardized stimuli, such as test items, or questionnaire items. The principal stimuli were considered to be those issues or concerns which were most relevant and natural to the interviewees. The four main themes emerging from the interviews are as follows:

A. Strength and weaknesses of on-site visitation.

B. Changes occurring in the areas of programs and services aimed at LEP students as a result of the on-site visitation.

C. Expertise and composition of on-site team members.

D. Possible changes of the on-site evaluation process with respect ot evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the On-Site Visitation

The interview data concerning the overall strengths of the on-site visitation were positive in many aspects. Issues which were identified as strengths of the on-site visitation were: the positive impact on LEA's, beneficial and timely final reports, opportunity by LEA personnel to express opinions, and the comprehensiveness of the evaluation process. The issues related to the weaknesses of the on-site visitation were the following: the composition of team members, likelihood of friends evaluating friends, lack of LEA preparation prior to on-site visitation, lack of team member preparation prior to on-site visitation, and inability to evaluate the quality of instruction and programs via the on-site process. The following quotations are presented as illustrative of the aforementioned issues:

The three phase strength; is the kind of in-service effect (it has) on the team members. Team members grow so much, just by being able to critically look at someone else's program. Also the idea that I get to take back to my school will help me out .... The one thing I think I'll be able to use are the industrial ed. competencies they have developed here. I've got a copy (of the competencies) the department head give me (team member).

My school was evaluated last year. I guess the strength that I saw was that I was interviewed at all. I'm a part-time teacher at my college, and I was interviewed after my 7 p.m. class. The team member must have been on campus till 10:30 that night. Thats why I volunteered to go back tonight, to interview the part-time faculty. Its important to interview everyone (team member).

Not only do team member get alot out of this (on-site visitation) but the school does too. The report is easy to read, and it's given to faculty. Faculty get to see the total picture, which they weren't willing to do alot of the time. The report covers alot, and thats good (LEA administrator).

The system has really made vocational education grow in Illinois. Ten years ago, vocational education programs were scarce. The on-site got LEA's off dead center. There has been alot of growth due to the Three Phase .... The growth isn't only in the number of vocational education programs, it's good quality training that kids are getting (team leader).

The system is one of the best in the states. Its been able to make vocational education grow. It's (The Three Phase System) given the job of evaluation to vocational educators themselves. Peer evaluation has been effective (DAVTE staff).

A weakness of the on-site is the over dependence on team leaders. Team leaders are given too much flexibility. The team leader should make certain all the areas are addressed, but some don't (local instructor).

The weakness I see, is the preparation the school does prior to the on-site; some just try to snowball you and others just aren't ready. The team needs more information that often isn't there. I'm in favor of the self-study that is being talked about (team leader).

> The problem with the system, is that it can be incestuous. By that I mean, it's highly likely for friends to be evaluating friends. We have had two on-sites, and each time I've had personal friends on the team.. That can be a little bias, I mean, it's all been very professional, but it just shouldn't happen (local administrator).

> The ability for the team to look at the quality of the programs is my concern. I've seen the system at work, but we aren't looking at the real quality (DAVTE staff).

Changes Occurring in the Areas of Programs and Services Aimed at LEP Students as a Result of the On-Site Visitation

The data concerning changes that had occurred in LEP programs and services as a result of the on-site visitation were not varied. The data disclosed a paucity of changes as a result of an on-site visitation. The following statements are examples of the issues related to this major theme.

> Don't expect too much of the system, since it wasn't designed to look at these types of programs (DAVTE staff).

> The program that we have here is not a result of the evaluation we had five years ago. Five years ago if I can recall right, there wasn't any emphasis on LEP students, it was the disadvantage and handicapped students who had the attention. The bilingual program is the result of community persons demanding--no asking that we provide some services (local administrator).

> Our school was evaluated last year, and I don't think our Hispanic (ESL Program) was ever mentioned in the report. Its doing a great job, but it wasn't looked at (team member).

Expertise and Composition of On-Site Team Members

The interview data regarding the effects that evaluation team members expertise has on the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP students were varied. The opinions ranged from the effects being unsubstantial, to being critical in evaluating these types of programs and services. The subsequent quotes portrays the variability.

When it comes to services for special needs students, the more administrators, and generalists the better handle you'll have on their (special needs students) needs (team leader).

I can't see how you can evaluate programs for LEP students if you don't have experts in that field. Most vocational instructors simply haven't had experience or even training for these kids. How can I say college is doing a good job serving the Indochinese or Latinos if I don't know what can or ought to be done for them. I know DAVTE doesn't know what to do (vocational instructor).

I've been on an on-site and I think the team did a good job. The team leader had us; she was good, interview persons out of our field. I'm a counselor, and I interviewed nurses, welders and administrators. The mixture is good. The team efforts is what makes it work (local counselor).

The team leader is the key to the evaluation. If he sees an area isn't being covered, he has to make sure everyone is interviewed and I guess the right questions are being asked. If I can see that, let's say LEP students aren't being addressed by Tuesday evening, then I make sure someone will cover it on the next day (team leader).

The team, I believe makes a difference. I suppose ideally we need someone with special needs interest on every team but it isn't feasible (State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, Member).

The system is overloaded already. Making sure each team has certain experts is just not possible. The team approach has worked (DAVTE staff).

I don't really think we need to make sure every team is balanced. The team leaders are the check and balance (local administrator).

Possible Changes of the On-Site Evaluation Process with Respect to Evaluating Programs and Services Aimed at LEP students

The interview data related to possible changes of the on-site evaluation process with respect ot evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students were diverse. Most persons interviewed focused on three issues, those being; the composition of the team, the interview task in the Team Member Handbook, and role of DAVTE in assisting LEA's implement recommendations from the final evaluation report. The following quotes will further illustrate.

> The DAVTE doesn't follow-up on the report. If they (the DAVTE) would follow-up and show schools how to start service for LEP's or any other area, schools would be more responsive. It's a problem of what comes first, the chicken or the egg? Springfield (the DAVTE) needs to take the lead. The (LEP) students are out there and schools won't start unless someone comes in and starts asking "What are you doing in this area?", and if the answer is zero. Then the follow-up has to be there (LEA administrator).
>
> If DAVTE knows which schools are claiming reimbursement for LEP students, then it should make certain someone on the team can address whatever is being done at the school (team leader).
>
> The state already has alot of data on LEP students. We all have to fill out the VEDS report. They (the DAVTE) need to take a look at that, the data is not being used (LEA administrator).
>
> The handbook (Team Member Handbook) doesn't tell members what to look for. It assumes team members will know how to evaluate programs for the special needs students. You can't assume all members will know how to determine impact of services (team leader).

EXTENT AND NATURE OF THE IMPACT

Several data gathering techniques were used to collect data regarding the extent and nature of the TPS impact on the local education agencies that were evaluated in FY 1980. The data were collected via a questionnaire, and formal and informal interviews.

Questionnaire on the Effects of the Three Phase System

A total number of 33 LEA's received the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to provide empirical data of the effect the on-site visitation had on programs and services provided to LEP students. A total number of 29 (87%) LEA's returned the questionnaire. However, eight of these 29 LEA's did not complete the questionnaire. These eight LEA's chose not to complete the questionnaire on the basis that their LEA's did not have LEP students. A typical response for not completing the questionnaire was:

> I am afraid this is not very useful to you. We have so few LEP students that most of the questions don't apply and, of course, the evaluation team really had nothing much to investigate as far as LEP program is concerned (LEA Director of Vocational Education).

The completed questionnaires totaled 21 (63.6%) of the total 33). These 21 questionnaires were used for the data analysis. The respondents were asked in the first nine items in the questionnaire to provide general background characteristics regarding their particular LEA and staff. The first questionnaire item which asked for the position title of the respondents indicated that the two most frequent positions were Director Vocational Education (28.5%) and Coordinator of Vocational Education).

Respondents indicated whether they had ever served as a member of a DAVTE on-site evaluation team. Fifteen (71.2%) indicated "yes" while six said they had not. Those that responded positively, were also asked to indicate how many teams they had been on. The total number of teams was 47, with the mean being 3.13 teams.

The respondents were also asked to indicate whether they spoke another language other than English. Nineteen indicated that they did not, while only two indicated they were fluent in a language other than English. These two respondents further identified the language and noted their speaking ability. One respondent rated his speaking ability of Spanish as "Good" while the second respondent rated his speaking ability of Slavic as "Fair".

Respondents were asked to rate the vocational education program in their districts. Over 76% rated the program in their district as "Above" or "Well above" average. The respondent rated the cooperation between vocational faculty teaching LEP students with both, the guidance/counseling personnel and the Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) faculty. The cooperation with the guidance/counseling personnel was rated as "High" by 52.3% and was rated as "Average" by 47.6% with the VESL/ESL faculty.

Respondents indicated the cultural sensitivity to LEP students of vocational instructors, guidance/counseling staff, VESL/ESL faculty, and administrators. Cultural sensitivity was defined as follows: "The ability to acknowledge and appreciate the reality of differences within and among ethnically or culturally diverse students." The results indicated "Average" cultural sensitivity of 61.9% for administrators, 57.1% for vocational instructors and guidance/counseling staff, and 38% for VESL/ESL instructors.

Respondents were also asked (to the best of their knowledge) to identify staff members which were able to communicate at least minimally with LEP students in their native language. The responses indicated that the following staff could communicate at least minimally: eight (6.9%) of 115 administrators, 15 (3.9%) of 377 vocational instructors, 25 (69.4%) of 36 VESL/ESL instructors, and 13 (13.6%) of 95 guidance/counseling staff.

Respondents indicated how often staff recently (within the last two years) had attended in-service presentations or workshops concerning issues and concerns of LEP students in vocational education programs and services. Over 76% of the staff had little or no in-service at all.

The remaining data in the questionnaire focused on the on-site visitation conducted in the respondents district in school year

1979-80. The first item focused on the on-site centered on the on-site visitation exit interview. Data was gathered concerning what persons involved with LEP students were invited to the exit interview and also how many attended. Administrators were the group most frequently invited 66.66%, followed by the vocational faculty and board members both at 42.85%. Table 4 further summarizes the data relative to the attendance of staff at the exit interview.

Respondent identification of those persons involved with LEP students that received the final report of the on-site evaluation are summarized in Table 5. It should be noted that vocational instructors were identified as receiving the report in 76.1% of the LEA's while administrators, guidance/counseling staff, and board members had received the report in 15 of the 21 responding LEAs (71.4%).

Respondents identification of the extent to which persons involved with LEP students were familiar with the information included in the evaluation report concerning LEP student programs and services are summarized in Table 6. Administrators were rated 7.42% as being "Moderately" to "Extensively" familiar with the evaluation report. The second most familiar ("Moderately" to "Extensively") were the guidance/counseling staff at 61.90%.

Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with the following statement: "I think the DAVTE on-site evaluation helped us to improve our entire vocational education program" All 21 (100%) respondents "Strongly agreed" or "Agreed" with the statement.

TABLE 4

IDENTIFICATION OF THOSE PERSONS INVOLVED WITH LEP STUDENTS THAT WERE INVITED TO THE ON-SITE EVALUATION EXIT INTERVIEW (N=21 LEAs)

Group	Invited to Exit Interview						Number That Attended Interview
	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE		
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	# Attending
Administrators	14	66.6	5	23.8	2	9.5	34
Vocational Instructors	9	42.8	10	47.6	1	4.7	15
VESL/ESL Staff	3	14.2	14	66.6	4	19.0	1
Guidance/ Counseling Staff	8	38.0	11	52.3	2	9.5	11
Parents	2	9.5	15	71.4	4	19.0	2
Board Members	9	42.8	9	42.8	3	14.2	19
Others (Advisory Council Members)	1	4.7	13	61.9	7	33.3	2

TABLE 5

IDENTIFICATION OF THOSE PERSONS INVOLVED WITH LEP STUDENTS WHO RECEIVED THE FINAL REPORT OF THE ON-SITE EVALUATION (N=21 LEAs)

Group	Received Report					
	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Administrators	15	71.4	4	19.0	2	9.5
Vocational Instructors	16	76.1	3	14.2	2	9.5
VESL/ESL Staff	7	33.3	10	47.6	4	19.0
Guidance/ Counseling Staff	15	71.4	5	23.8	1	4.7
Parents	1	4.7	4	19.0	2	9.5
Board Members	15	71.4	14	66.6	6	28.5
Others (Advisory Council Members)	1	4.7	11	52.3	9	42.8

TABLE 6

IDENTIFICATION OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH PERSONS INVOLVED WITH LEP STUDENTS WERE FAMILIAR WITH THE INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE EVALUATION REPORT CONCERNING LEP STUDENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES (N=21 LEAs)

Group	Extent of Familiarity									
	Extensively		Moderately		Little		None		No Response	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Administrators	7	33.3	8	38.0	3	14.2	1	4.7	2	9.5
Vocational Faculty	2	9.5	8	38.0	8	38.0	1	4.7	2	9.5
VESL/ESL Faculty	4	19.0	6	28.5	5	23.8	3	14.2	3	14.2
Guidance/Counseling Staff	4	19.0	9	42.8	4	19.0	2	9.5	2	9.5
Board Members	2	9.5	9	42.8	7	33.3	1	4.7	2	9.5
Parents	1	4.7	1	4.7	6	28.5	6	28.5	7	33.3
Others Not Identified	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.7	4	19.0	15	71.4
Advisory Council Members	0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		

Specifically, 7 (33.3%) responded with "Strongly agree" and 14 (66.6%) responded with "Agree".

In addition to the preceding questionnaire item, respondents were also asked to rate their agreement with the following statement: "During the DAVTE on-site evaluation our LEA got some good ideas on how to improve the vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP students." Nearly 62% agreed or strongly agreed while 33.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The data are further summarized in Table 7. The succeeding questionnaire item was also rated for agreement: "To the best of my knowledge the DAVTE evaluation team members who interviewed our LEA were knowledgable in the area of LEP students." Over 52% agreed or strongly agreed while 28.57% disagreed and 19.04 indicated a "Don't know" response. This data is summarized in Table 8.

Respondents were also asked a question regarding an increased awareness of program improvement resurces. The following statement was posed: "Through the on-site evaluation, our LEA became aware of resources and services that will/are being used to improve programs and services for LEP students." Over 38% "agreed" or "strongly agreed" while 52.1% "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed." Respondents were also asked to what extent have these resources been utilized? Respondents selected the response options as follows: "moderately" 28.5%, "little" 23.8% and "not at all" 28.5%. The data is summarized in Table 9.

TABLE 7

RATINGS THAT DURING THE DAVTE ON-SITE EVALUATION THE RESPONDENT'S LEA GOT SOME IDEAS ON HOW TO IMPROVE THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AIMED AT LEP STUDENTS (N=21 LEAs)

Question	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
*14. During the DAVTE on-site evaluation our LEA got some good ideas on how to improve the vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP students.	Strongly Agree	2	9.52
	Agree	11	52.38
	Disagree	6	28.57
	Strongly Disagree	1	4.76
	Don't Know	1	4.76

* Number corresponds to question number on Questionnaire on the Effects of the Three Phase System, Appendix B

TABLE 8

RATINGS OF THE DAVTE EVALUATION TEAM MEMBER's KNOWLEDGE OF LEP PROGRAMS AND STUDENTS (N=21 LEAs)

Question	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
*15. To the best of my knowledge the DAVTE evaluation team members who interviewed our LEA were knowledgable in the area of LEP students.	Strongly Agree	2	9.52
	Agree	9	42.85
	Disagree	6	28.57
	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
	Don't Know	4	19.04

* Number corresponds to question number on Questionnaire on the Effects of the Three Phase System, Appendix B

Respondents were asked if their district had requested DAVTE consultant services to assist with implementing the recommendations regarding LEP students. Fifteen (71.4%) of the respondents selected response option "YES" while 4 (19.0%) indicated "NO". If respondents answered "YES", they were asked to describe the services received. Four descriptions were provided:

> Consultant to investigate the lack of students in our home economics program.
>
> Special needs consultants.
>
> Staff consultant gave workshop for the Staff, studying LEP student programs.
>
> Consultant services - Industrial Education

Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with the following statement: "In your opinion, was adequate time spent by the evaluation team in examining the programs and services related to LEP students?" Over 52% "Agreed" or "Strongly agreed" while 23.8% "Disagreed" or "Strongly disagreed" with the statement. FIve (23.8%) indicated that they did not know. Respondents were also asked to rate their agreement with the following statement: Many of the changes that will/are being made in our vocational education program and services for LEP students have been the result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report." Thirty-three (33) percent "Agreed" or "Strongly agreed" while 66.6 per cent "Disagreed" or "Strongly disagreed" with the statement, The preceeding data are further illustrated in Table 10.

Data Gathered Through Interviews

Following the Questionnaire on the Effects of the TPS, interviews were conducted with personnel of three selected LEAs, team leaders, LEP students and regional vocational administrators. The

TABLE 9

RESPONDENTS RATINGS ON THE AWARENESS AND USE OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT RESOURCES AND SERVICES (N=21 LEAs)

Question	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
*16. Through the on-site evaluation, our LEA became aware of resources and services that will/are being used to improve programs and services for LEP students.	Strongly Agree	1	4.76
	Agree	7	33.33
	Disagree	6	28.57
	Strongly Disagree	6	28.57
	Don't Know	1	4.76
To what extent have these resources been utilized?	Extensively	0	0.0
	Moderatly	6	28.57
	Little	5	23.80
	None at All	6	28.57
	No Response	4	19.04

* Number corresponds to question number on Questionnaire on the Effects of the Three Phase System, Appendix B

TABLE 10

RATINGS ON THE TIME SPENT BY THE EVALUATION TEAM ON LEP PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND ON CHANGES RESULTING FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE ON-SITE EVALUATION REPORT (N=21 LEAs)

Question	Response Option	Frequency	Percentage
*18. In your opinion, was adequate time spent by the evaluation team in examining the programs and services related to LEP students?	Strongly Agree	1	4.7
	Agree	10	47.6
	Disagree	3	14.2
	Strongly Disagree	2	9.5
	Don't Know	5	23.8
*19.. Many of the changes will/are being made in our vocational education program and services for LEP students have been the result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report.	Strongly Agree	2	9.5
	Agree	5	23.8
	Disagree	8	38.0
	Strongly Disagree	6	28.5
	Don't Know	0	0.0

* Numbers correspond to question numbers on Questionnaire on the Effects of the Three Phase System, Appendix B

purpose of the interviews were to acquire a further in-depth perspective of the impact of the on-site visitation had upon programs and services provided to LEP students. Based on the responses to the questionnaire, and a review of the LEA's on-site evaluation report, interviews were conducted with an emphasis to clarify and amplify data gained through the questionnaire and the evaluation report.

Three types of LEA's were selected for further study, one suburban secondary school district, one suburban area vocational center and one urban community college. Selection was based on the criteria discussed in Chapter Three.

The Suburban Secondary School District

The suburban secondary district consists of two schools, one established in 1926, and the other in 1959. This school district includes 16½ square miles of industrial community wrapping around a major airport serving the largest city in the state. The school district's population is multi-ethnic including students of German, English, Scotch, Irish, Italian, Polish and Scandinavian ancestry. According to the LEA's One and Five Year Plan for vocational education, there is a growing minority population of Spanish-speaking students and two and one-half percent of the families are below poverty level. The socio-economic level of the students may be considered lower-middle class.

The school district offered vocational programs in the following areas: home economics, business, marketing and management, and industrial. The on-site evaluation reported, stated that the mandates of Title IX had been reviewed and implemented throughout the vocational education programs. However, in-service activities related to eliminating sex bias/role stereotyping should be offered.

The report also stated that the mandates relative to disadvantaged and handicapped students had been reviewed and implemented throughout the vocational education program. However, vocational faculty should be involved in the preparation of Individualized Education Programs (IEP's) for special education students mainstreamed in their program (P.L. 94-142). Reference to LEP student issues, concerns, programs or services were not mentioned in the final on-site evaluation report. No conclusions were written concerning identification criteria or special services to LEP students.

This data was supported by the responses in the Questionnaire on the Effects of the TPS. The questionnaire responses for this particular LEA indicated that this LEA indeed, had not received any ideas on how to improve programs and services to LEP students. In addition, the responses also indicated that the LEA had not become aware of program improvement resources through the on-site final evaluation report.

Data gathered through the interviews supported data gathered through the questionnaire and analysis of the final on-site evaluation report. The vocational director stated that he was "never asked any specific questions dealing with LEP students." The principal and the vocational director both agreed that the strength of the entire TPS was the mixture of team members. However, it was also pointed out by the vocational director, that there was a potential problem in "knowing who is coming to evaluate the program". The objectivity of team members evaluating professional peers or friends according to the vocational director, could be assured if the Team Leader kept the team members on task.

Changes had occurred within the last two years in the area of programs and services aimed at LEP students. The major change was an increase of ESL faculty working with vocational faculty in modifying, and integrating instructional lessons for LEP students. The district as a whole had formalized a stronger commitment toward ESL practices due to highly motivated and energetic ESL faculty.

The team composition for this particular evaluation was a "well balanced team" according to the Team Leader. This was supported by the vocational director: "The team I believe was knowledgeable in most areas. The team leader was an excellent person, she did a good job keeping the team on task".

The recommendations provided by several administrators at this school were the following:

> I suppose first of all, there must be an agreement that there is a problem. People in Springfield need to make Team Leaders aware of the problems of LEP students. Team Leaders have a responsibility along with the Team Member Handbook to ask questions. There is a danger, not all schools need to do the same thing for LEP's... but ask questions when it's applicable. For instance, if a district is claiming LEP students, then the team needs to ask some specific questions (LEA administrator).
>
> The one recommendation is to make certain that some generalists are on the team. Administrators and vocational education generalists possibly have a broader perspective. They deal with larger issues on a regular basis (LEA administrator).

The Team Leader when interviewed suggested the following recommendation:

> The improvement will have to depend on the Team Leaders, The have to make certain all areas are covered in an evaluation. It's hard to get a team which will be experts in all fields. It's up to the Team Leader (Team Leader).

The data gathered concerning the effect on the on-site evaluation had upon the secondary school indicated minimal impact. School personnel perceived recent changes within their district as receiving impetus from the districts ESL faculty. Impact on the entire district's vocational education programs was seen as positive and extensive.

The Surburban Area Vocational Center

The Surburban Area Vocational Center (AVC) provides vocational opportunities primarily for the juniors and seniors of the 21 participating high schools. Enrollment is on an elective basis from each local high school. There are approximately 900 student learning stations available during a single shift per day. The 11th and 12th grade enrollments in the 17 participating high schools is approximately 12,000 students. The AVC is organized under five major areas with a total offering of 19 specific vocational clusters. The five major areas are:

1. Applied Biological and Agricultural
2. Business, Marketing and Management
3. Health
4. Home Economics Occupations
5. Industrial Oriented

The on-site evaluation report stated that the student services personnel were to be commended fc establishing a formalized system for identifying disadvantaged and handicapped students. The report however, did not mention the programs or services directed at LEP students. No information was given with respect on how to start or improve current practices relative to LEP students.

This lack of mention of LEP students in the evaluation report was supported by the responses contained in the Questionnaire on the Effect of the TPS. The respondent disagreed that the LEA had gained some good ideas relative to LEP students, and also disagreed that the LEA had become aware of resources or services that would be used to improve programs and services for LEP students. Further, the respondent disagreed that the changes being made in the LEA's vocational education program and services for LEP students were the result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report.

Data gathered through the interviews reflected the data found in the questionnaire and the evaluation report. The interviews with the director of the AVC, assistant director, vocational coordinator, and the director of the assessment center did not perceive the on-site evaluation as being very helpful relative to LEP students. Emphasis appeared to be placed on the usefulness of the self-study which took place in 1978-79 (the year prior to the on-site visitation). The self-study was seen as being very productive. The self-study had been designed in parallel to the DAVTE on-site evaluation. The same program components were used, and also questions from the "DAVTE Team Member Handbook" were taken verbatim. Within the self-study report for fiscal year 1978-79, recognition was given for the need to gather vocational assessment and educational materials to better serve LEP students.

The interviews with AVC staff reflected the following perspectives:

> The strength (of the on-site evaluation) lies in the in-service of the team members. Team members are able to have positive relationships with instructors, so they (instructors) can express themselves. The on-site makes people feel like someone gives a damn (LEA administrator).
>
> The advisory manner of the team is good. Peers evaluating peers is the strength. What needs improvement is that team members don't know what to look for. Dissemination is not there. There hasn't been a great deal of information for modification or sample materials. With special needs students, information on how to modify programs, materials that are available, are not being disseminated to team members (AVC administrator).
>
> The biggest weakness is that there isn't any follow-up by DAVTE (AVC administrator).
>
> When it comes to serving students with special needs, the emphasis has to come from the state. The on-site last year didn't place any on LEP students (AVC administrator).
>
> The impetus or the motives for change, when it concerns LEP students are several. First, there's the reimbursement from the state. Second, the incentive that we feel all kids should succeed. You can't turn away kids, for any reasons. Third, the laws require you to serve all kids, like Public Law 94-142. You have the responsibility to do so and to do it well. The last one is the self-study. We know what we were doing for all kids, but our weakest area is serving LEP students. We all know what we are doing, it's the self-awareness that helps (AVC administrator).
>
> There is a definite need for improvement of the on-site. The problem is that there is little understanding of what LEP means. Many people feel that LEP only refers to Hispanics not the many Vietnamese, Laotions. What is needed are P.R. activities. Both team members and team leaders need to be made aware. The change needs to start with the state (the DAVTE). The evaluations have really focused on the handicapped students and on sex biasis, but no one, the state hasn't placed enough (emphasis) on how to or what to do for LEP students (AVE administrator).
>
> The fact that no one has held back on funding for not reacting to recommendations is the biggest weakness of the system. The report is not taken seriously. There is not any serious follow-up by DAVTE (Team leader).

The data gathered concerning the effect of the on-site evaluation on the AVC indicated little impact. AVC personnel attributed recent improvements in programs and services to LEP students to an internal self-evaluation. Effects on the overall vocational education programs were seen as positive but limited.

The Urban Community College

This urban community college which is southeast of Chicago, serves an area of approximately 150,000 population. It serves an area which is multi-ethnic including students of German, English, Italian Polish and Scandinavian ancestory. There is also a sizable Hispanic community which has been a stable force in the community for several generations. This Hispanic population has recently been noticeably growing according to census data. The socio-economic level of students in the college may be considered lower-middle class.

The on-site evaluation report did not contain specific conclusions relative to programs and services aimed at LEP students. However, there were several statements relative to the mainstreaming of handicapped and disadvantaged students in the evaluation report. The report noted that faculty felt that mainstreaming of handicapped and disadvantaged students was not being accomplished and that it was not viewed as either necessary or beneficial to the students involved. In addition, the report noted that several faculty members interviewed expressed concern relative to mainstreaming. It was their opinion that this practice was not to be encouraged.

The information collected in the questionnaire revealed that the respondent agreed that the LEA had gained some good ideas relative to LEP student programs and services, and also agreed that the LEA had become aware of resources and services that were being used to improve programs and services for LEP students. In addition to this, the respondent also agreed that adequate time was spent evaluating LEP programs and services and also that changes made in the LEA's vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP students had been that result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report.

The fact that no mention was made concerning LEP programs and services in the evaluation report but yet, the questionnaire responses indicated that the on-site evaluation had produced positive results was clarified through interviews with the community college personnel. The interviews revealed that indeed the on-site report for fiscal year 1980 had not effected programs and services provided to LEP students. The conflict in data arose from the fact that the last on-site evaluation (5 years prior to the evaluation of FY 1980) did have a positive effect on programs aimed at LEP students. The respondent perceived the programs and services provided to LEP students as a direct result to the on-site evaluation held in fiscal year 1975.

The interviews reflected the following perspectives:

> The on-site five years ago started us down the road in helping us deal with these (LEP) students. This last year, the evaluation addressed it to a degree. I don't think it ever got into it as far as it should have...In the last two years there has been some growth in this area. Especially with enrollment of these (LEP) students in technical programs. Any recent changes have been because of the Career Dean (Community College administrator).

> The Three Phase System got us off of dead center. Five years ago we weren't doing anything. It got us started in thinking of what has to be done with none English speaking persons (Community College administrator).
>
> The strength of the evaluation is the way the data and information is gathered. It gets at the strengths and weaknesses of the local agencies. The mixture of people and how they are expected to look at a broad basis is good. The mixture and cross-over in the interviewing process can get a wide area of information... the weakness is the prior preparation to the on-site evaluation. The team leader needs to be given more information, to help identify strengths and weaknesses. Also the timing of interviews is really rushed. Don't increase team members, but maybe more time for interviews. Perhaps, start using self-study, not as extensive as the North Central self-studies (Team Leader).
>
> Every team must look at what is happening for LEP students. Orientation must take place for all members. Team leaders need to be made aware to make an effort to assign team members to look at these (LEP) activities. The Team Member Handbook and also the information given to team leaders need to add some direction for LEP programs...The DAVTE needs to revise the Team Member Handbook and survey instruments (Preliminary Evaluation Instruments). Are limited English speaking students being helped with every institution? This needs to be asked. Are these students provided with a ladder to help them move on particularly from ESL and continuing education classes into career areas (Community College administrator).
>
> An awareness of team members by the team leader will dictate how much emphasis to place on different things. The team leader has to take responsibility to ask "What about LEP programs and services?" The team leader is the key (Team leader).

The data gathered concerning the effect of the on-site evaluation on the community college indicated a significant effect. Interviews with the community college personnel indicated that improvements in programs and services to LEP students were a result of the on-site evaluation of FY 1975. Effects on the overall vocational education program were seen as positive and extensive.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the study was to provide a better understanding of the processes used by the Illinois DAVTE in evaluating vocational education programs and services aimed at limited English proficient (LEP) students in Illinois. This was accomplished by developing and portraying a comprehensive picture of the current evaluation process. Included in the body of data were the views and concerns of several groups who are involved in and affected by the on-site evaluation process for vocational education programs in Illinois. Data, views, concerns, and improvement-oriented recommendations were collected from Team Leaders, Team Members, local administrators, teachers, counselors, students and community members, as well as DAVTE personnel. Responses to a series of four major research questions were sought:

1. What procedures has the DAVTE undertaken in order to evaluate programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
2. What are other states doing in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP populations?
3. What are the views and concerns of the DAVTE staff, local administrators and board members, instructors, students and community members with respect to the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP populations?
4. What is the extent and nature of the impact on local education agencies that were evaluated in FY 1980 and are serving LEP students?

A variety of procedures were used to collect the data utilized in the study:

1. Participant-observation, document analysis and interviews were conducted while the principal investigator participated in three on-site evaluations of local education agencies providing programs and services to LEP students.

2. A questionnaire was developed to obtain input from state vocational education directors, regarding the current practices of states in evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.

3. Interviews were conducted with 47 individuals to discover and verify the views and concerns regarding the present on-site evaluation system. The interviews included: DAVTE staff, local administrators, instructors, students and community members, i.e., employers, parents, Advisory Council members, etc.

4. A questionnaire was developed to obtain input from selected LEA personnel, regarding the impact on programs and services provided to LEP students that were evaluated by the TPS in fiscal year 1980. Follow-up phone and personal interviews were conducted to acquire a further in-depth perspective of the impact. In addition, document analysis was conducted to consider the composition of the on-site evaluation team, recommendations made by the team, changes in the One and Five Year Plan, and also the number of LEP students being served by the LEA.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation Procedures of the Illinois DAVTE

In 1971-72 the Illinois DAVTE developed and implemented a formal planning and evaluation system to insure the maintenance, growth, and quality of *all* vocational education programs and services (Illinois State Board of Education, 1980). In order to fully understand the procedures of this Three Phase System (TPS) several types of data were collected (See Appendix C, for a full description of the system). Data was collected through participant-observation in three actual on-site evaluations, review of relevant documents and instruments, and also through interviews with Team Members and Leaders, LEA personnel, and staff from the DAVTE.

The data indicated that indeed, the TPS is well received by the LEA's. Personnel at the local education agencies and the Team Members perceived the overall on-site evaluation as a positive and useful activity. These positive feelings toward the overall on-site evaluation appear to dissipate somewhat with particular reference to the usefulness of the on-site visitation in evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.

The procedures and instruments provided by the on-site evaluation did not appear to assist either the Team Leader or Members in assessing the quality of programs serving LEP students. The most specific evaluative task under the Student Services Section of the Team Member Handbook focused on the "appropriateness of criteria used to identify disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English proficiency students and the impact of additional services provided to these students." However, little information or guidance was given to Team Leaders or Members in order to determine appropriate identificaton criteria or substantial impact. The process seems to rely very heavily upon the knowledge of Team Leaders and Team Members in determining the extent and quality of programs and services for LEP students.

Specific information and guidelines provided by the DAVTE concerning programs and services for LEP students is very limited. Currently, the most substantial piece of information provided by the DAVTE to LEAs and to Team Leaders is a handbook developed by

Lopez-Valadez (1979) entitled: Vocational Education for the Limited English-Speaking: A Handbook for Administrators. While this handbook provides an excellent overview and introduction to funding resources and initial programmatic concerns, it does not provide indepth information regarding theoretical, methodological and programmatic issues relative to providing services to LEP students.

Since the efforts of serving LEP students in vocational education is new, there is very little experience to draw on, and very little written on which to base a conceptual framework (Hurwitz, 1981). Most of the past professional experience of the DAVTE staff, Team Leaders and Members, and LEA personnel generally appear to be very limited relative to programs and services for LEP students in vocational education. This void in experience in providing services to LEP students clearly affects the comprehensive and quality of programs provided, as well as how these programs are evaluated.

The scope and size of the present TPS may also affect its ability to do a thorough evaluation. The TPS was field-tested at seven sites during 1970-71. The 1971-72 evaluations included 70 LEAs, the 1972-73 evaluations expanded to 116 LEAs, 72 evaluations were evaluated during 1974-75, 78 were evaluated during 1976-77, 153 were evaluated during 1977-78, 150 LEAs were evaluated in 1978-79, and 148 LEAs were evaluated in 1979-80 (Illinois State Board of Education, 1980). According to the 1978-79 Composite Report, the 148 LEAs evaluated in FY 1979 included: 129 secondary schools, and post-secondary community colleges, and 10 state agencies in corrections, mental health and rehabilitation services. Teams ranged from 1 to 33 members in size and involved over 750 total Team Members.

The TPS has provided over the last decade beneficial evaluation results which have assisted in the overall development, planning and accountability tasks of the DAVTE. However, in view of the steady increase of LEAs that are being evaluated each year, and also given that three-day on-site evaluations with small teams are the primary method of evaluating LEAs; it is therefore doubtful, whether the on-site evaluations can produce thorough and comprehensive evaluations. Consideration must be given to the fact that, fiscal resources are probably insufficient for conducting "true" comprehensive indepth evaluations.

Evaluation Procedures of Other States

The questionnaire which was mailed to state vocational education directors was designed to provide some empirical account of how many states have a separate or specific evaluation process for evaluating vocational education programs serving LEP students. More specifically, the intent of the questionnaire was to identify the nature and extent of evaluation practices in other states. Data were obtained via questionnaire responses from 41 states and four territories. Additional data were also obtained from state education agency (SEA) personnel via follow-up telephone interviews.

Results from the questionnaire indicated that the vast majority of states (91%) did not have a separate evaluation process for evaluating programs serving LEP students. This data is consistent with a study undertaken by the National Institute of Education (NIE). The study by NIE focused on significant consequences of selected changes in federal vocational education legislation adopted in 1976 (Education Amendments of 1976, P. L. 94-482). The study's interim report by NIE (1980) in speaking about how states were evaluating programs for special populations stated the following:

> Less attention has been given to the fourth requirement laid down by the regulations, evaluating the results of additional services to special populations. The program review process typically examines the attention given to special populations, but focuses on access, not the results of, vocational programs and services. (National Institute of Education, 1980, p. V-12).

Data from the questionnaire indicated that 85% the respondents felt their states were effective in meeting the evaluation requirements set forth by Section 112 (Education Amendments of 1976). Forty-six percent (46%) of the respondents indicated that their state was effective in evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students. Further 33% of the respondents felt their state was effective in utilizing evaluation results in the improvement of programs and services aimed at LEP students. Overall these data reflected an optimistic and positive view of state efforts in this area. However, 37% indicated that their efforts needed to be revised to meet the needs of LEP students.

States in general are evaluating and collecting data on programs and services aimed at LEP students in a limited fashion. The types of data collected address access and criteria for identification. The data do not reflect impact of vocational education programs.

Data collected is reflective of the information needs required by the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS). The VEDS was a result of the 1976 Education Amendments (Sec. 112). The evaluation requirements (Sec. 112) intended to promote a rational planning and systematic national evaluation process. Information in the VEDS includes: instructional expenditures, classification of students by handicapped, disadvantaged, LEP, racial/ethnic, and sex. In addition, student unduplicated headcounts in occupational programs are also reported. The data in the VEDS are aggregated across localities, and states to form a national picture (Section 153(a)(1)).

Quality of programs and services provided to LEP students is rarely accomplished. According to Smith and Holt (1980), the evaluation procedures for the measurement of student achievement constitutes the least developed component of state vocational education evaluation systems. Smith and Holt (1980) state the following: "Only one-fifth of the states had in 1978 procedures for the assessment of student achievement; those procedures were mostly in the development or pilot-testing state" (P. 34).

Mainly through the impetus of Public Law 94-482 which identified persons of LEP as a national priority, states began developing programs and services to meet the needs of LEP students. However, the development and evaluation requirements specified in the law (P.L. 94-482) required knowledge and expertise which many state personnel did not appear to have.

Critical Views and Concerns

Interviews were conducted with a variety of individuals. Persons interviewed were members of the State Advisory Council for Vocational

Education, staff of the DAVTE, local administrators, local instructors, local guidance and counseling personnel, students and community members. The total number of interviews held with different individuals totaled forty-seven (47). Some persons were interviewed twice for the purpose of amplication, clarification or verification of themes and issues. The analysis of the data gained through the interviews was an ongoing process.

Four themes were identified by the interviewers as being major issues or concerns relevant to the evaluation of vocational programs or services serving LEP students. The interviewer was not attempting to generate standardized stimuli, such as test items or questionnaire items. The principal stimuli was considered to be those issues or concerns which were most germane or natural to the interviews. The four main themes emerging from the interviews are as follows:

A. Strengths and weaknesses of the on-site visitation.

B. Changes occurring in the areas of programs and services aimed at LEP students as a result of the on-site evaluation.

C. Expertise and composition of on-site Team Members.

D. Possible changes of the on-site evaluation process with respect to evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.

The discussion and conclusions drawn from the data collected via the interviews will be presented according to the four main themes.

A. Strengths and weakness of the on-site visitation.

Strengths of the on-site evaluation which were identified are as follows: the positive effects on team members, the positive impact on LEA's, beneficial and timely evaluation reports, opportunity by LEA personnel to express opinions, and the comprehensiveness of the evaluation process. The issues related to the weaknesses of the on-site evaluation are as follows: the composition of the team members, likelihood of friends evaluating friends, lack of LEA preparation prior to on-site visitation, lack of team member preparation prior to on-site visitation, and the inability to evaluate the quality of instruction and programs via the on-site process.

The strengths and benefits of the on-site evaluation process are generally seen as far out-weighing it's weaknesses. The TPS was perceived by local administrators, Team Leaders, and the staff of the DAVTE as being the "moving force" which assisted vocational education to develop and maintain a high level of quality throughout the State of Illinois. Most weaknesses of the system were perceived as minor deficiencies of an otherwise excellent system. The impact of the TPS on LEAs over the last ten years was seen as most productive. However, Team Leaders and local administrators which had extensive experience with the TPS expressed a concern relative to lack of follow-through on recommendations by the DAVTE. This lack of follow-through on recommendations both by LEAs and the DAVTE may very well affect the effectiveness of the TPS in the future.

B. Changes occurring in the area of programs and services aimed at LEP students as a result of the on-site evaluation.

The interview and questionnaire data concerning changes that had occurred in LEP programs and services as a result of the on-site visitation did not reflect variability. The data consistently reflected a paucity of changes as a result of an on-site visitation. The scarcity of changes which were attributed to the on-site evaluation are most likely explained by (1) the lack of emphasis placed on LEP students by the TPS, and (2) the lack of awareness concerning LEP student needs by the on-site evaluation team. This dearth of emphasis and awareness on LEP students appears to significantly affect the quantity and quality of conclusions, recommendations, and suggested improvements provided in the final on-site evaluation report.

The content related to LEP issues and concerns found in final on-site evaluation reports were extremely scarce. In reviewing final evaluation reports, conclusions and recommendations generally addressed whether handicapped, disadvantaged or LEP students were receiving additional services. The quality or impact of these services were rarely addressed. Additionally, suggested improvements rarely reflected comprehensive or in-depth improvements toward LEP programs and services. Those changes occurring in LEAs according to interviews, were the results of LEA personnel interests and efforts in the quest to better serve LEP students.

C. Expertise and composition of on-site team members.

The interview and questionnaire data regarding the effects that evaluation team member expertise have on the evaluation of programs and services aimed at LEP students were varied. The data ranged from the effects being unsubstantial to being critical in evaluating these type of programs and services. Persons who perceived the effects on the programs as being unsubstantial, also viewed the concept of teamwork as being productive and beneficial. Team Leaders were often times viewed as the key to the comprehensiveness of the on-site evaluation. Team Leaders are generally expected by the DAVTE to be cognizant of issues and concerns relative to LEP student programs and services.

Selection of qualified team members was seen as essential and advantageous for a comprehensive evaluation. Local education agencies which were serving LEP students and were being evaluated by an on-site team which did not have an experienced special needs team member, were perceived as not fully benefiting from a comprehensive on-site evaluation.

D. Possible changes of the on-site evaluation process with respect to evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.

The interview and questionnaire data related to possible changes of the on-site evaluation process regarding LEP students were diverse. Most persons interviewed focused on three changes. They were as follows: the composition of the team, the interview tasks in the Team Member Handbook, and the role of the DAVTE in assisting LEA's implement recommendations found in the final evaluation report.

The changes suggested in the interviews indicated the lack of emphasis by the TPS on LEP issues and concerns and also the lack of awareness concerning LEP student needs by on-site evaluation teams. Possible changes which were suggested, attempt to increase the emphasis on LEP student programs and services by adding interview task to the Team Member Handbook and also by insuring that team members have the necessary experience and knowledge relative to LEP programs and services. Persons interviewed realize the lack of expertise and information available regarding LEP students and appeared to place the responsibility with the DAVTE for increasing the emphasis on LEP student programs and services and the awareness of LEP student needs. This could be accomplished by disseminating the most up-to-date developments and strategies on how to serve LEP students via publications, in-service workshops, consultant services and through an on-site evaluation which could cultivate, sensitize and encourage LEAs to better serve LEP students.

The Extent and Nature of the Impact

Several data gathering techniques were used to collect data regarding the extent and nature of the TPS impact on local education agencies that were evaluated in school year 1979-80. The data were collected through a questionnaire and formal and informal interviews. The questionnaire which was mailed to 33 LEA vocational education directors was designed to provide some quantifiable measures of the effect the on-site visitation had on programs and services provided to LEP students. Following the Questionnaire on the Effects of the TPS, interviews were conducted with personnel of three selected LEAs, Team Leaders, LEP students, and regional vocational administrators. The purpose of the interviews were to acquire a further in-depth perspective of the impact of the on-site evaluation upon programs and services provided to LEP students.

Results from the questionnaire indicated that over 76% of the respondents rated their overall vocational education program in their district as being "above" or "well above" average. Data also indicated that a minimal percentage (0.06%) of LEA administrators, vocational instructors and guidance/counseling personnel were able to communicate at least minimally with LEP students in their native language. Furthermore, the data indicated that 76% of the LEA staff had little or no in-service training concerning issues and concerns of LEP students within the last two years.

Data from the questionnaire regarding the impact of the on-site evaluation were varied. Nearly 62% of the responding administrators indicated that the LEAs had gotten some good ideas on how to improve programs and services aimed at LEP students. However, over 66% of the respondents indicated that the changes that were being made in programs and services for LEP student were not the direct result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report. Moreover, 57%

indicated that the on-site evaluation process had not assisted their LEAs in becoming aware of resources or services designed to improve programs and services aimed at LEP students.

The data acquired through interviews depicted minimal impact on programs and services aimed at LEP students by the on-site evaluation. Changes that were made in the improvement of programs and services were perceived as a direct result of the efforts of LEA personnel and were not direct results of the on-site evaluation.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The DAVTE on-site evaluation process was discovered to be a formidable positive factor in the overall maintenance, growth and quality of vocational education programs and services in Illinois. This study revealed, however, that the on-site evaluation process was having a minimal positive impact on vocational education programs and services serving LEP students. While vocational education programs aimed at LEP populations are a relatively recent educational forum, very little is known about the operation of these programs, the instructional practices, and the effects on trainees in Illinois and other states.

The TPS in accomplishing it's three general goals of developing, planning and insuring accountability for vocational education, should serve to make persons involved in vocational education more aware of LEP issues and concerns. Furthermore, the on-site evaluation process in evaluating services provided to LEP populations should also serve to increase the awareness and emphasis on LEP students within the state and local education agencies. In addition to obtaining this increased awareness of and emphasis on LEP students, formative program data would assist LEAs in making appropriate changes and improvements in programs and services provided to their LEP population. In view of the minimal positive impact the on-site evaluation is having on programs and services serving LEP students, recommendations are provided to strengthen an already excellent TPS. These recommendations represent a host of views collected in the study; they are global in nature and are not presented in a prioritized fashion.

> The DAVTE should continue with the on-site evaluation with some modification.
>
> The DAVTE should evaluate the entire TPS to insure quality of programs and instruction of all vocational education in the State of Illinois.
>
> The DAVTE should establish procedures to identify individuals who can serve as consultants to the DAVTE and LEAs relative to evaluation of LEP programs and services. These individuals could provide several types of services; serve as Team Members, provide inservice training to Team Leaders, Team Members, and LEA personnel. They could also assist in identification and development of criteria and guidelines for quality programs and services provided to LEP students.
>
> The DAVTE should develop and/or identify existing resources which would assist LEAs in developing and evaluating programs and services to LEP students.
>
> The DAVTE should develop criteria and guidelines to assist Team Leaders and Team Members in evaluating programs and services aimed at LEP students.
>
> The DAVTE should increase the utilization of data already being collected via the student/employer follow-up studies and the VEDS reporting system relative to LEP students. Utilization may include studies and special reports concerning effects of vocational education programs and services on LEP populations.

The DAVTE should modify or supplement the Team Member Handbook, the School and Community Data Form, the student and faculty Preliminary Evaluation Instruments to solicit specific data relative to quality and impact of programs and services provided to LEP students.

The DAVTE should increase and strengthen it's follow-up activities following on-site evaluations. This activity will insure and assist LEAs with the implementation of the recommendations made by the on-site evaluation team.

The DAVTE should study the benefits of incorporating a self-study component into the TPS.

The DAVTE should consider utilizing of a separate evaluation process (separate from the TPS) which would provide an in-depth perspective on programs and services serving LEP students. Possible evaluation alternatives could be:

1. Identify a cadre of consultants which are knowledgeable in the area of LEP students, and contract these consultants to conduct an in-depth evaluation of programs and services provided to LEP students

2. Select LEAs that are serving communities with a sizable LEP population and have a consultant from the DAVTE, the Regional Vocational Administrator and an LEP consultant conduct an in-depth evaluation of the programs and services provided to LEP students

3. Once every four years the DAVTE should require LEAs that are serving LEP students, to conduct internal in-depth evaluations with regards to the programs and services being provided to LEP students. LEAs could possibly acquire assistance from the cadre of consultants identified in alternative 1

The DAVTE should sponsor further studies on how to provide comprehensive and quality vocational education programs and services to LEP students. In addition, studies should focus on how to determine the effects of these programs and services on LEP students.

Local education agencies should utilize the Locally Directed Evaluation Materials provided by the DAVTE to evaluate their own programs and services aimed at LEP students. This locally directed evaluation process would assist LEA personnel in becoming more aware of LEP student needs and consequently change or improve the programs and services being afforded to LEP students.

Local education agencies should develop procedures for identifying LEP students in vocational education. This lack of procedures is consistent with the findings reported by Cheaney (1981).

Local education agencies should be supportive of the efforts of vocational instructors, VESL/ESL instructors and the guidance/counseling staff in serving the needs of LEP students.

LEA's should utilize whatever resources or services that are made available to them by DAVTE concerning LEP student programs and services.

Universities should offer off-campus courses for local personnel on planning and evaluating vocational education programs and services for LEP students.

Universities should encourage further research on the planning and evaluating of vocational education programs and services for LEP students.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. B. and Ball, S. The Profession and Practice of Evaluation. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Bilingual Vocational Education Project. Vocational Education for the Limited English Speaking: A Handbook for Administrators. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Illinois Office of Education, Illinois State Board of Education, 1979.

Boydan, R. and Taylor, S. J. Introduction to Qualitative Methods. New York, New York: John Wiley, 1975.

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E. A., Amarel, M. Methodology in Educational Evaluation and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Cheaney, R. D. An Analysis of Criteria and Systems for Identifying Disadvantaged and Handicapped Vocational Students in Illinois Public Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1981.

Cohen, D. K. Politics and Research. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 213-238.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Day, E. C., and Phelps, L. A. Vocational and Career Education Opportunities for Limited English Proficiency Students (forthcoming), 1980.

Denzin, H. K. The Logic of Naturalistic Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin (Ed.) Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

The Education Amendments of 1968. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

The Education Amendments of 1974. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

The Education Amendments of 1976. Washington, D. C.P U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Gowin, D. B. and Millman, J. Meta-Evaluation and a Direction for Research on Evaluation. CEDR Quarterly, 1978, 11, 3-6.

Guba, E. G., "The Failure of Educational Evaluation", Educational Technology, Vol. 5, No. 5, 1969.

Guba, E. G. Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation: CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation #8. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1978.

House, E. R. "Justice in Evaluation". In G. V. Glass (ed.) Evaluation Studies Annual Review, Vol. 1, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1976.

House. E. R. Evaluating With Validity. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.

Hurwitz, A. Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training, Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1979.

Hurwitz, A. F. The Preparation of Bilingual Vocational Instructors: A Strategic Analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1981.

Illinois State Board of Education. Annual Report Fiscal Year 1979 Vocational Education in Illinois: IMPACT . Springfield, Illinois: Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, 1979.

Illinois State Board of Education. An Analysis of 1 and 5 year Plans for LEP Student Information. Illinois Office of Education, 1980.

Illinois State Board of Education. Composite Evaluation Report; Vocational Education in the State of Illinois, Fiscal Year 1980. Springfield, Illinois: Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, 1980.

Illinois State Board of Education. Rules and Regulations for the Administrators of Vocational Programs. Springfield, Illinois: Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, 1980.

Korn, A. G. Program Evaluation in CETA/Vocational Education, Special Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation Linkages. Interchange Leadership Training Institute. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1980.

Lopez-Valedez, J. E., and Balasubramonia, K. Limited English-Speaking Adults in Illinois: A Linguistic Demographic Report Based on a Documentary Survey. Arlington Heights, IL: Bilingual Vocational Education Project, 1978.

Lopez-Valdez, J. E. Vocational Education for the Limited English-Speaking: A Handbook for Administrators. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Bilingual Vocational Education Project, 1979.

Lopez-Valadez, J. E. Problems, Programs and Policies: A Review of Career/Vocational Education for Hispanics (Mimeo). Arlington Heights, IL: Bilingual Vocational Education Project, 1980.

National Institute of Education. The Vocational Education Study: *Interior Report, Vocational Education Study Publication #3.* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1980.

Norton, D. P. and Watley, D. J. *The Efficiency and Efficacy of the Evaluation Practices of the Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education.* (Final Report). Evanston, Illinois: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Patton, M. Q. *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Phelps, L. A. Someone with Special Needs: An Alternative Definition. *Illinois Career Education Journal*, 1976, 33, 27-28.

Phelps, L. A. Research on Vocational Education Programs for Special Population: Research Review. In T. L. Wentling (ed.) *Arrive: Annual Review of Research in Vocational Education, Volume One.* Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois and Illinois State Board of Education, 1980.

Reichardt, C. S. and Cook, T. D. Beyond Qualitative Versus Quantitative Methods, in Charles S. Reichardt and Thomas P. Cook (Eds.), *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1979.

Sanchez, C. A. *A Historical Analysis of Selected Bilingual Vocational Programs: An Administrative Model for Developing and Implementing a Bilingual Vocational Program at the Post-Secondary Level*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1980.

Sciven, M. S. An Introduction Meta-Evaluation, *Educational Product Report*, 1969, 2, 36-38.

Smith, E. G., and Holt, N. L. State Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs: A National Study of Evaluation Procedures and Practices. *The Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 1980, Vo. V, No. 1, pp 17-39

Smith, T. R. *On-Site Evaluation of Occupational Education in Illinois*. Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois: Urbana-Champaign, 1979.

Spier, J. E. *The Case Study Method: Guidelines, Practices, and Applications for Vocational Education*. Columbus, Ohio; The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1980.

Stake, R. E. *Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1975(a).

Stake, R. E. Using Issues to Structure Research. Champaign, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, (mimeo), 1979.

Stufflebeam, D. L. *Meta-Evaluation Occasional Paper #3*, Western Michigan University, Evaluation Center, 1978.

Stufflebeam, D. L. *Meta-Evaluation*. Kalamazoo: Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, 1978.

Troike, R., Lugo, I. and Galvan, M. M. *Strategies for Success in Bilingual Vocational Training*. Arlington, Virginia: Inter-american Research Associates, forthcoming.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *The Survey of Income and Education, Spring, 1976*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics and U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1976.

U. S. Department of Education. *Opportunities in Bilingual Vocational Training*, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U. S. Department of Labor and the U. S. Office of Education. *The Status of Bilingual Vocational Training: Fiscal Year 1976. Report of the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Labor to the President and the Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

U. S. Department of Labor. *Workers of Spanish Origin: A Chartbook*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1978.

U. S. Department of Labor. *Knowledge Development Report 10.1, Hispanic Youth Employment Establishing a Knowledge Base*. Washington, D.C.: The National Council of LaRaza, 1979.

U. S. Department of Labor. *Youth Knowledge Development Report 10.2, A Profile of Hispanic Youth*, Washington, D.C.: Office of Youth Programs, 1980.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

The Vocational Amendments of 1966. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON EVALUATION PRACTICES

Your cooperation is requested in completing the attached questionnaire concerning evaluation practices being used to evaluate vocational education services aimed at limited English proficiency (LEP) students. This study is being conducted by the Research, Evaluation, and Program Improvement for Limited English Proficiency Students in Vocational Education Project in cooperation with the Illinois Office of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify evaluation practices being used to meet the requirements set forth by Section 112 of the Education Amendments (Public Law 94-482). The information will expand our knowledge of the currently used evaluation methodologies and aid in providing a foundation for the development of a system that adequately evaluates services provided for LEP students in all state programs.

Please return the completed questionnaire by December 12, 1980 to:

L. Allen Phelps
Department of Vocational
and Technical Education
University of Illinois
805 W. Pennsylvania
Urbana, IL 61801

If you have any questions call us at (217) 333-2325.

Your prompt response to this request will be greatly appreciated.

PLEASE CHECK THE ANSWER YOU MOST AGREE WITH AND PROVIDE BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS WHEN NECESSARY.

1. Does your state have a separate evaluation process for evaluating vocational programs serving Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students? (separate from regular vocational education evaluation or other state evaluation systems)

   YES _____ NO _____

   If the answer is YES, please provide a brief description.

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

2. Your state is effective in meeting the requirements set forth by Section 112 (Title II Education Amendments of 1976) in evaluating all vocational education programs.

Strongly Agree ____
Agree ____
Neutral ____
Disagree ____
Strongly Disagree ____

3. Your state is effective in evaluating services and programs aimed at LEP students.

Strongly Agree ____
Agree ____
Neutral ____
Disagree ____
Strongly Disagree ____

4. Your state is effective in utilizing evaluation results in improvement of services and programs aimed at LEP students.

Strongly Agree ____
Agree ____
Neutral ____
Disagree ____
Strongly Disagree ____

5. The evaluation efforts in your state need to be revised to meet the needs of LEP students.

Strongly Agree ____
Agree ____
Neutral ____
Disagree ____
Strongly Disagree ____

6. Do you feel your state's follow-up studies of LEP students need to be improved?

YES _____ NO _____

If the answer is YES, please provide a brief description of the improvements you feel would be necessary.

____

____

____

____

7. Do you feel state's employer follow-up studies of LEP students need to be improved?

YES _____ NO _____

If the answer is YES, please provide a brief description of the improvements you feel would be necessary.

____

____

____

____

8. Please send us any material or literature that describes evaluation process or that supplements your answers in the questionnaire. Please notify us prior to mailing if there is a charge for these materials.

9. Would you like to receive the results of this study?

YES _____ NO _____

Please fill in your name, address, and phone number for possible future communication regarding more detailed explanations of evaluation practices.

____

____

____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX B

Sequence # ______

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF THE ILLINOIS SYSTEM FOR EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION UPON THE PROGRAMS SERVING LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS

Your cooperation is requested in completing the following questionnaire concerning programs and services provided to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students. The focus of this questionnaire is to determine the impact of the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) on-site evaluation conducted in fiscal year 1979-80. The study is being conducted by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in cooperation with the Illinois State Board of Education and the DAVTE.

Specifically, this questionnaire attempts to identify evaluation practices that have effected programs and services aimed at LEP students. The information gained will expand our knowledge of the impact of the currently used evaluation process.

Information obtained in this questionnaire will be kept in confidence. Please respond to all items based on your experience and best judgement.

DIRECTIONS

There are no right or wrong answers for the items in this questionnaire. The value of this study depends on your best judgements. Please attempt to respond to all items. Answer each question by circling the answer code unless otherwise instructed. (Use the Don't Know (DK) only if you simply cannot use another response category.)

---

1. What is your position title? ______________________________

____

2. Have you ever served as a member of a DAVTE on-site evaluation team?

Yes 1

No 2

If your response to question 2 is Yes, on how many teams have you served?

________ teams.

3. Do you speak another language other than English?

Yes .... 1 No 2

If your response to question 3 is Yes, please list your language(s) and note your speaking ability.

Language	Fair	Good	Excellent

4. How would you rate the vocational education program in your district?

Well above average 1
Above average 2
Average 3
Below average 4
Well below average 5

5. Rate the cooperation between vocational faculty teaching LEP students and the guidance/counseling personnel.

High cooperation 1
Average cooperation 2
Low cooperation 3

6. Rate the cooperation between vocational faculty teaching LEP students and the vocational English as a second language (VESL) faculty or the English as a second language (ESL) faculty.

High cooperation 1
Average cooperation 2
Low cooperation 3

7. To the best of your knowledge rate the cultural sensitivity to LEP students by the following staff (e.g. the ability to acknowledge and appreciate the reality of differences within and among ethnically or culturally diverse students).

	Cultural Sensitivity		
	High	Average	Low
Vocational instructors	1	2	3
Guidance/Counseling staff	1	2	3
VESL/ESL instructors	1	2	3
Administrators	1	2	3

8. To the best of your knowledge how many of the following staff are able to communicate at least minimally with LEP students in their native language? (e.g. 1 of 3, 1 of 1)

Language(s)

____ of ____ Administrators ________________________

____ of ____ Vocational faculty ________________________

____ of ____ VESL/ESL faculty ________________________

____ of ____ Guidance/Counseling staff ________________________

9. How often has staff recently (within the last 2 years) attended in-service presentations or workshops concerning issues and concerns of LEP students in vocational education programs and services?

Extensively 1
Moderately 2
Little 3
None 4

The remaining questions focus on the on-site evaluation conducted in your district in school year 1979-80.

---

10. What persons involved with LEP students were invited to the on-site evaluation exit interview? (Circle Yes or No)

YES	NO		How Many Attended?
1	2	Administrators	__________
1	2	Vocational instructors	__________
1	2	VESL/ESL staff	__________
1	2	Guidance/Counseling staff	__________
1	2	Parents	__________
1	2	Board members	__________
1	2	Others __________	__________

11. What persons involved with LEP students received the final report of the on-site evaluation? (Circle YES or NO)

YES	NO		Estimate % who received report
1	2	Administrators	__________%
1	2	Vocational faculty	__________%
1	2	VESL/ESL faculty	__________%
1	2	Guidance/Counseling staff	__________%
1	2	Board members	__________%
1	2	Parents	__________%
1	2	Others __________	__________%

12. To what extent are the persons involved with LEP students familiar with the information included in the evaluation report concerning LEP student programs and services?

	Extensively	Moderately	Little	None
Administrators	______	______	____	__
Vocational faculty	______	______	____	__
VESL/ESL faculty	______	______	____	__
Guidance/Counseling staff	______	______	____	__
Board members	______	______	____	__
Parents	______	______	____	__
Others ______________	______	______	____	__

For each of the following statements please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree. If you simply cannot respond to an item, circle 9 for don't know. Circle only __*one*__ *response for each statement.*

---

13. I think the DAVTE on-site evaluation helped us to improve our entire vocational education program.

Strongly agree	 1
Agree	 2
Disagree	 3
Strongly disagree	 4
Don't know	 9

14. During the DAVTE on-site evaluation our LEA got some good ideas on how to improve the vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP students.

Strongly agree	 1
Agree	 2
Disagree	 3
Strongly disagree	 4
Don't know	 9

15. To the best of my knowledge the DAVTE evaluation team members who interviewed our LEA were knowledgable in the area of LEP students.

Strongly agree	 1
Agree	 2
Disagree	 3
Strongly disagree	 4
Don't know	 9

16. Through the on-site evaluation, our LEA became aware of resources and services that will/are being used to improve programs and services for LEP students.

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	4
Don't know	9

To what extent have these resources been utilized?

Extensively	1
Moderately	2
Little	3
Not at all	4

17. The district has requested DAVTE consultant services to assist with implementing the recommendations regarding LEP students.

Yes	1
No	2

If your response to question 17 is Yes, please describe the services received.

____

____

____

____

____

____

18. In your opinion, was adequate time spent by the evaluation team in examining the programs and services related to LEP students?

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	4
Don't know	9

19. Many of the changes that will/are being made in our vocational education program and services for LEP students have been the result of information provided by the on-site evaluation report.

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	4
Don't know	9

Please list any changes.

20. Please add any other comments, perceptions, recommendations, etc., regarding the evaluation of vocational education programs and services aimed at LEP students.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Juan C. Gonzalez
Department of Vocational
and Technical Education
University of Illinois
805 W. Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

APPENDIX C

Three Phase System for Statewide Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs (TPS)

The goals of the TPS are:

1. To promote and assist in the development of quality vocational programs in local education agencies;
2. To foster maximum utilization and accountability of state and federal funds allocated to local vocational programs.
3. To provide the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education of the State Board with necessary data for statewide planning of vocational education.

The TPS was developed to emphasis the importance for a continuing mechanism for improving local agency vocational education programs and services. The TPS requires individual commitment at the state and local levels to evaluation as a vehicle for program improvement. The TPS has three phases:

Phase One Development of Local Plans
Phase Two Review and Approval of Local Plans
Phase Three On-site Visitation

The following descriptions are drawn from the Evaluation Handbook for Team Leaders, by the Illinois State Board of Education (1980).

Phase One

Phase One focuses on internal evaluation and planning of the total vocational education program at the local level. Responsibility for this Phase rests with local education agency personnel along with members of the board of control and advisory groups who conduct locally directed evaluation activities and hold planning sessions. The outcome of Phase One is a document entitled the Local Agency One and Five Year Plan for Vocational Education. The Local Plan describes the components and operation of the total agency vocational education program.

Phase Two

Phase Two provides for a review and analysis of the proposed total program of vocational education. This is accomplished through the review of Local Plan by a cadre of State Board staff who determine its appropriateness in light of local needs and resources. The outcome of Phase Two is an approval status for the One and Five Year Plan. A Plan may be "Approved," "Conditionally Approved," or "Not Approved."

Phase Three

Phase Three of the System provides an external review of the total vocational education program by a team of persons from outside the local agency. This review focuses on the extent to which the educational agency is meeting student, employer and community needs as reflected in the agency's own Local Plan. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1980, p. 4).

The TPS emphasized the evaluation of the quality of the total vocational program and its component parts. Six program components have been identified as essential to the success of the vocational education program. The following descriptions of the six components are drawn from An Overview for Team Members by the Illinois State Board of Education, (1981).

PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Evidence is gathered by the team to determine the adequacy of the local educaiton agency's system for establishing total program goals, identifying needed vocational programs, and designing instruction. Additionally, the local education agency's system of evaluating both the processes of instruction and the outcomes or impact of programs is assessed.

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The team analyzes the quality of each vocational program through interviews and document review to assess the availability of programs to all students as well as program scope and course sequence. Additionally, the team will assess the adequacy of internal resource utilization within various programs.

STUDENT SERVICES

The various support or ancillary services provided to vocational students are reviewed by the evaluation team. Services such as guidance and counseling, placement, and student testing are focused on through the interview and document review process. Services for special populations such as the disadvantaged, limited English proficiency, handicapped minority groups and women are also included in this component.

PERSONNEL

The team reviews personnel qualifications in light of personnel development needs and analyzes the type and extent of participation in various personnel development activities such as professional organizations, workshops, and courses.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The team examines the way vocational programs are managed. This includes review of both the administrative structure as well as the operational effectiveness of the structure. This component includes management at all levels of the local education agency that contributes to the delivery of instruction and services to vocational students.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES

The team focuses on this component to determine to what extent the local education agency has involved community representatives and utilized community resources in the development, operation and evaluation of vocational programs. The use of advisory committees, cooperation with other educational and service agencies and cooperative education pursuits are examples of areas to be reviewed in this component.

In order to insure a thorough on-site evaluation of a local agency's vocational education program, the team will consist of individuals varying in areas of expertise. Team members are selected from outside the immediate locale of the local education agency. Team members representing the following three areas are selected for each evaluation. They are:

1. Business, industry, or labor representatives who have a concern for and an interest in vocational education.
2. Practicing educators who have demonstrated teaching, administrative or student support service expertise in vocational education.
3. Advanced students and graduates of vocational programs.

The number of team members in each of these three categories depends upon size and the characteristics of the agency being evaluated. The following is a typical schedule for a four-day visit as described in the Team Leader Handbook.

Previsitation Activities

Day One -- Team Leader Meeting with Agency Representative
Team Member Orientation

Day Two -- Staff-Team Orientation
Interviewing
Team Conference (Report Writing)

Day Three -- Interviewing
Finalize Evaluation Report

Day Four -- Summary Conference

For a five-day visit, Day Two and Day Three will be essentially the same, Day Four will be as Day Three above, with the summary conference on Day Five.

Materials are provided to the team members prior to the on-site visitation. The local agency and the DAVTE send each member copies of:

1. The Local Plan which was prepared by the local agency staff (in Phase I) and approved by the State Board Staff (in Phase II). The Local Plan describes what the agency is doing for vocational students.
2. The Team Member Handbook contains primary goals and interview tasks. The preliminary evaluation information gathered from students and faculty will be provided by the team leader. These data related to the interview tasks are used to formulate conclusions for the evluation report.

The end product of the on-site visitation is an evaluation report reflective of the local agency's total vocational education program. The evaluation report contains conclusions, recommendations and suggested improvements which address the specific needs of the agency being evaluated. The report is duplicated by the DAVTE and returned to the LEA in sufficient quantity for distribution to faculty, the board of control and other persons involved in the program improvement process. The LEA must respond to each recommendation in Section B (Program Improvement Plan) of the next One and Five Year Plan submitted the following Spring.

Various type of data gathering instruments are used in the on-site visitation. These instruments include Student and Faculty Preliminary Evaluation Instruments (PEI), the School and Community Data Form, the Team Leader Questionnaire, the Student and Employer Follow-up Surveys, and the Team Member Handbook (which provides Primary Goals and Interview Tasks for the team members).

The results of the Student and Faculty PEI's and the data from the School and Community Data form are given to the team members during the team orientation and are also incorporated into the Team Member Handbook. This data aides the team members in conducting interviews and writing the evaluation report.

142

APPENDIX D

OFESSIONAL STAFF FORM

DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING
Use #2 pencil only-erase cleanly
Mark only one answer per item.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. I am:
○ Male ○ Female

2. Your present primary position is?
○ Administration ○ Instruction
○ Guidance

3. If instruction, in which vocational area are you most involved?
○ Agriculture
○ Business, marketing, management
○ Health
○ Home Economics
○ Industrial
○ Cooperative Education

4. How many years of experience in vocational education have you had (teaching, guidance, administration)?
○ 0 - 4 years ○ 13 - 16 years
○ 5 - 8 years ○ 16 or more years
○ 9 - 12 years

5. How many years of work experience outside of education have you had in your area of teaching?
○ None ○ 9 - 12 years
○ Less than 1 year ○ More than 12 years
○ 1 - 4 years ○ I am not presently teaching
○ 5 - 8 years

6. Are you presently a member of a professional vocational organization related to your field, such as the Illinois Vocational Association?
○ Yes ○ No

PROGRAM INFORMATION

7. Are there written and measurable objectives for the following:
a. The program(s) in which you teach, administer, or provide guidance?
○ Yes ○ No
b. The course(s) in which you teach, administer, or provide guidance?
○ Yes ○ No

8. How would you describe the locally selected (self) evaluation system for vocational education in your agency?
○ A formal evaluation system exists
○ Some informal evaluation activities exist
○ In the process of being developed
○ No evaluation activities exist

9. If a formal evaluation system exists in your agency, are the results utilized in program planning and development?
○ Yes ○ No
○ No formal evaluation system exists

10. Have you had the opportunity to make contributions to the development of your local agency One and Five Year Plan for Vocational Education?
○ Yes ○ No
○ I wasn't here when the Plan was developed

11. If your agency previously had a State Board of Education vocational program evaluation, did you receive a copy of the evaluation report?
○ Yes ○ No
○ I wasn't here then

12. If you received a copy of the evaluation report, was the report used in making program improvements?
○ Yes ○ No
○ I wasn't here then

13. To what extent are you involved with the vocational advisory council/committee(s)?
○ Extensively ○ Little
○ Moderately ○ None

14. Does your agency have a system for identifying disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English proficiency students?
○ Yes ○ No

15. Do you have students in your class(es) who are:
a. Disadvantaged?
○ Yes ○ No ○ Uncertain
b. Limited in English proficiency?
○ Yes ○ No ○ Uncertain
c. Handicapped?
○ Yes ○ No ○ Uncertain

16. Are additional services provided by your agency for disadvantaged, limited English proficiency and handicapped students (other than special education)?
a. Disadvantaged?
○ Yes ○ No ○ Uncertain
b. Limited in English proficiency?
○ Yes ○ No ○ Uncertain
c. Handicapped?
○ Yes ○ No ○ Uncertain

17. How would you rate the local board's support of vocational education?
○ High ○ Average ○ Low

18. How would you rate guidance personnel's support for vocational course and program offerings?
○ High ○ Average ○ Low

19. Do guidance personnel and instructors work together in:
a. Identifying student's needs and interests
○ Extensively
○ Moderately
○ Little
○ None
b. Student Placement
○ Extensively
○ Moderately
○ Little
○ None

20. How would you rate the working relationship among vocational faculty and agency administrators?
○ High ○ Average ○ Low

21. How would you rate the adequacy of equipment, facilities and safety in your agency?
a. Equipment
○ Up-to-date ○ Fair ○ Obsolete
b. Facilities
○ Up-to-date ○ Fair ○ Obsolete
c. Safety (housekeeping, eye protection, ventilation, etc.)
○ Up-to-date ○ Fair ○ Obsolete

22. Are the vocational courses offered by your agency sequentially structured into programs?
○ All courses are part of a sequence
○ Most courses are part of a sequence
○ Some courses are part of a sequence
○ Courses are not sequentially structured

23. To what extent have you been involved in articulating vocational programs, such as discussions with other program personnel, both within and outside of your agency?
○ Extensively
○ Moderately
○ Little
○ None

24. Do you encourage students of either sex to enroll in your vocational courses?
○ Yes ○ No

25. Are handicapped students encouraged to enroll in vocational courses?
○ Yes ○ No

26. Have you participated in vocational inservice activities which emphasized equal educational opportunity for all students?
○ Yes ○ No

27. Does an effective public relations system exist for the total vocational education program?
○ Yes ○ No

DO NOT MARK HERE

⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪
①	①	①	①
②	②	②	②
③	③	③	③
④	④	④	④
⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤
⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥
⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦
⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧
⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨

NCS Trans-Optic 08 9449 321

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION—ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STUDENT FORM

DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING:

- Use #2 pencil only-erase cleanly.
- Mark only one answer per item.
- Fill circle completely.

improper ⊘⊙◐○ proper ●●●●

1. I am:
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

2. The vocational program in which I am enrolled is:
   ○ Agriculture
   ○ Business
   ○ Health
   ○ Home Economics
   ○ Industrial

3. I am in:
   ○ 9th grade (Freshman)
   ○ 10th grade (Sophomore)
   ○ 11th grade (Junior)
   ○ 12th grade (Senior)

   ○ 13th grade (College)
   ○ 14th grade (College)

4. Who influenced you the most to enroll in your vocational course?
   ○ Teacher or Administrator
   ○ Guidance Counselor
   ○ Friend(s)
   ○ Parent

5. I am a member of a student organization or club conducted as a part of my vocational course.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

6. Have you ever taken a written test in school to help you explore your job interests?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

7. Last year I met with a teacher or counselor concerning my career:
   ○ More than 5 times
   ○ 4 - 5 times
   ○ 2 - 3 times
   ○ Once
   ○ Never

8. How would you rate the information you have received from teachers or counselors regarding your future job?
   ○ High
   ○ Average
   ○ Low

9. Is there a series of vocational courses that you are encouraged to take to prepare for a job?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

10. Does your school have a placement service that helps you find a job after graduation?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

11. Do you feel your teachers have clearly explained what you are supposed to learn in your vocational courses?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

12. Are your vocational courses providing skills you need to get a job?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

13. Who would you talk to if you needed to find a job?
   ○ Teacher
   ○ Guidance Counselor
   ○ Friend(s)
   ○ Parent
   ○ Other

14. How would you rate your vocational teacher's knowledge of the job in which you are interested?
   ○ High
   ○ Average
   ○ Low

15. How would you rate your counselor's knowledge of the job in which you are interested?
   ○ High
   ○ Average
   ○ Low

16. Do your vocational teachers use field trips or guest speakers to give you more information about jobs?
   a. Field Trips
      ○ Yes
      ○ No
   b. Guest speakers
      ○ Yes
      ○ No

17. Have you ever had the chance to write down for your vocational teachers how you feel about your vocational courses?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

18. Can you take a vocational course that is usually taken by students of the opposite sex?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

19. Would you take a vocational course that is usually taken by students of the opposite sex?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

20. When you graduate, do you expect to: (Mark only one)
   ○ get a job doing what you are learning?
   ○ get a job similar to the one you are learning?
   ○ continue studying about the same job at another school?
   ○ make little use of what you are learning?

21. Would you recommend the vocational course you are taking to a friend?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

22. Would you recommend the vocational course you are taking to a member or the opposite sex?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

DO NOT MARK BELOW THIS LINE

SCHOOL CODE
DO NOT MARK HERE

⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪
①	①	①	①
②	②	②	②
③	③	③	③
④	④	④	④
⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤
⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥
⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦
⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧
⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨

NCS Trans-Optic:08-9448-321

Legal Name of Agency

Legal Number of Agency

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Program Approval and Evaluation Section
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY DATA

1. ☐ YES ☐ NO Does your agency conduct an annual, formal, locally directed evaluation of the vocational education program?

2. ☐ YES ☐ NO Does your agency's locally directed evaluation system include utilization of any of the State Board sponsored Locally Directed Evaluation materials?
If yes, check applicable activities listed below:

☐ Developing an Evaluation System
☐ Student Follow-Up Survey
☐ Employer Follow-Up Survey
☐ Student Evaluation of Instruction
☐ Assessment of Student Services
☐ Assessing Student Career Instruction
☐ Assessment of Instructional Materials
☐ Evaluation of Facilities
☐ Internal/External Team Review
☐ Evaluating the Career Information Program
☐ Personnel Evaluation and Development
☐ Identification of Occupational Competencies
☐ Assessment of Services for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped
☐ Assessment of Student Attainment of Objectives
☐ Analysis of Community Resources
☐ Cost/Outcome Analysis

3. ☐ YES ☐ NO Is an annual evaluation report prepared summarizing the results of data gathered in vocational programs?

Who prepares the annual evaluation report?____________________________

If yes, who receives copies of the report?

☐ Board of Control
☐ Advisory Councils/Committees
☐ Occupational Staff
☐ Student Services Personnel
☐ Agency Administration

4. ☐ YES ☐ NO Does your agency utilize job market demand information in planning vocational programs?
If yes, what specific materials are utilized?

5. What was last school year's dropout rate for all high school students? (Not applicable for post-secondary)
Dropout rate is equal to the percent of all school leavers other than transfers. __________

6. ☐ YES ☐ NO Does your agency have a formal system developed to assess student achievement of occupational competencies?
If yes, what kinds of instruments/measures are used?
Sample instruments might be provided to the evaluation team leader.

7. ☐ YES ☐ NO Does your agency provide adult vocational education programs designed to serve members of the community?
If yes, identify any special programs provided by the agency to serve displaced homemakers or workers re-entering the labor market.

ISBE 15-61 (7/80)

8. Indicate the number of students involved in each vocational student organization available to students in your agency.

NAME OF ORGANIZATION		MEMBERSHIP	SPONSOR'S NAME
FFA	(Future Farmers of America)		
FHA-HERO	(Future Homemakers of America - Home Ec. Related Occup.)		
FBLA -	(Phi Beta Lambda) (Future Business Leaders of America		
AIASA	(American Industrial Arts Student Association)		
VICA	(Vocational Industrial Clubs of America)		
DECA	(Distributive Education Clubs of America)		
IOEA	(Illinois Office Education Association)		
HOSA	(Health Occupations Student Association)		
Other			

9. a) With the exception of cooperative education students, does your agency provide formalized placement services for

☐ Yes ☐ No 1. Enrolled students (summer and/or part time placement)?

☐ Yes ☐ No 2. Dropouts/School Leavers?

☐ Yes ☐ No 3. Graduates?

b) Who is responsible for placement and in which department is the placement service located?

10. ☐ Yes ☐ No Are the agency's vocational programs and services free of sex bias/sex role stereotyping and cultural differences?

11. ☐ Yes ☐ No Do the vocational faculty in your agency who teach skill training (typically grades 11-14) have documentation on file to show that they have 2,000 hours of non-educational work experience applicable to their instructional assignment?

12. ☐ Yes ☐ No Have any formal processes been instituted by your agency to aid in identifying the vocational inservice needs of staff? If yes, what specific types of staff development/in-service activities are conducted, e.g., State Board in-service funding (Request for Application), State Board consultant visitations, etc.?

13. What percent of time is allocated to the person in charge of fulfilling vocational education administrative duties, e.g., work with advisory councils/committees, preparation of the Local Plan and vocational claim forms, planning and evaluation, etc? ____________

14. ☐ Yes ☐ No Does the One and Five Year "Plan Developer" have a vocational education background, e.g., vocational instructor. If yes, please describe briefly.

15. What percent of the total agency budget is allocated for vocational education program purposes? ____________

16. How would you rate the extent to which financial resources are allocated by your agency to support quality vocational education programs?

☐ High. Quality programs are not hindered by the lack of financial resources allocated for vocational programs.
☐ Moderate. It is difficult to maintain quality programs given the financial resources allocated for vocational programs.
☐ Low. Quality programs have declined due to the lack of financial resources allocated for vocational programs.

17. If additional federal/state financial resources were made available to support your agency's vocational education program, how would these resources be best utilized? Rank order from 1 to 5, 1 being highest.

_________ Equipment
_________ Expanded Program Offerings
_________ Facilities
_________ Materials and Supplies
_________ Salaries
_________ Other (please specify)_________________________________

18. ☐ YES ☐ NO Do citizens from your community serve on vocational education advisory councils/committees?
If yes, is there: ☐ YES ☐ NO one advisory council for all of the agency's vocational programs?
☐ YES ☐ NO a separate committee for each vocational program?

List the vocational programs having advisory committees, the number of meetings held per year by each committee and the names of agency staff who work with each committee.

19. Indicate with a check who appoints the vocational advisory councils/committees in your agency and to whom these councils/committees report.

	Vocational Advisory Councils/Committees APPOINTED BY:	Vocational Advisory Councils/Committees REPORT TO:
Board of Control		
Chief Agency Administrator		
Vocational Planner/Director/Dean		
Department Chairpersons		
Vocational Instructors		
Other (specify)		

20. Check the advice and assistance types of functions which your agency's vocational advisory councils/committees are asked to perform:

- ☐ Advising on development of vocational program policy
- ☐ Determining vocational program goals and requirements
- ☐ Developing vocational objectives for instructional programs
- ☐ Evaluating the vocational program with respect to employment needs
- ☐ Advising school administrators on qualifications needed by specialized vocational instructors
- ☐ Assisting long term planning for vocational programs including: curriculum, equipment and facilities
- ☐ Promoting vocational programs and services to students and the community
- ☐ Other (please specify)

21. ☐ YES ☐ NO Does your agency participate in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program or with other state and locally funded vocational training programs?

If yes, specify the extent of the coordination.

22. What agency in your immediate area is responsible for programs funded under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)?

23. How would you rate the working relationship that exists between the vocational training provided by your agency and the job training provided through your local CETA representative?

- a. ☐ High. Training programs and services are regularly coordinated.
- b. ☐ Moderate. Some training programs and services are coordinated.
- c. ☐ Limited. Most training programs and services are not coordinated.
- d. ☐ No coordination of programs and services is underway at this time.

24. What percentage of your student population (unduplicated count) is enrolled in vocational education programs? ______________

25. Total number of students enrolled in cooperative education programs ______________

26. CURRENT UNDUPLICATED ENROLLMENT Provide the current unduplicated enrollment for each of the vocational areas by grade level for your agency. (Students should not be counted in more than one class).

	AGRICULTURAL		BUSINESS, MARKETING AND MANAGEMENT		HEALTH		HOME ECONOMICS		INDUSTRIAL		TOTAL	
	In-District Enrollments	Joint Agreements (Include AVC)	In-District Enrollments	Joint Agreements (Include AVC)	In-District Enrollments	Joint Agreements (Include AVC)	In-District Enrollments	Joint Agreements (Include AVC)	In-District Enrollments	Joint Agreements (Include AVC)	In-District Enrollments	Joint Agreements (Include AVC)
K - 8												
9th Grade												
10th Grade												
11th Grade												
12th Grade												
Post-Secondary												
Continuing (Adult)												
TOTAL												

ID # ______________ 1-4

For Office Use Only

On-Site Evaluation Instrument

Team Leader Form

Agency Name: ____

Date: ______________________________

Please circle one code number for each question unless otherwise specified.

1. Rate the extent to which personnel related to the vocational program (administrators, guidance instructors, etc.) are involved in preparing the One and Five Year Plan for Vocational Education.

Extensive. Appropriate personnel are involved . . . 1 5

Moderate. Some personnel are involved 2

Limited. The Plan is prepared with minimal input
from staff 3

2. How would you rate the vocational education programs of the agency?

High. A very extensive and comprehensive program
is being offered 1 6

Average. A program exists but is not serving all
who could benefit from such an experience 2

Low. A minimal program exists which should be further
developed and refined 3

3. Is occupational information provided in elementary feeder schools?

Yes. Most feeder schools are providing occupational
information to students 1 7

Some. Only some of the feeder schools are providing
occupational information to students 2

No. None of the feeder schools are providing
occupational information to students 3

4. Rate the extent to which agency personnel are involved with articulation efforts within the institution and with other institutions (K-Adult).

Extensive. Agency personnel actively encourage and participate in vocational program articulation activities 1 8

Moderate. Articulation efforts appear to be sporadic and without coordination 2

Limited. Minimal articulation activities are underway at this time 3

5a. Does the agency claim disadvantaged, handicapped or limited English proficiency students?

Yes 1 9

No *(Skip to Q.6)* . . . 2

b. Does the agency identify disadvantaged, handicapped or limited English proficiency students as stated in the Local Plan?

Yes 1 10

No 2

c. Does the agency serve disadvantaged, handicapped or limited English proficiency students as stated in the Local Plan?

Yes 1 11

No 2

In some instances . . 3

6. Does the agency place handicapped vocational education students in the least restrictive educational environment?

Yes 1 12

No 2

In some instances . . 3

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of existing vocational student organizations within the agency.

High. Most organizations are effective 1 13

Average. A few of the organizations are effective but most are minimally effective . 2

Low. Organizations are very limited in membership and attendence 3

8a. To what extent is the vocational advisory council/committee(s) in the agency composed of representatives of business, industry and labor?

High. The council/committee(s) represents business, industry and labor 1 14

Moderate. One of the areas (business, industry and labor) is not represented on the council/committee(s) 2

Limited. More than one of the areas (business, industry, labor) is not represented on the council/committee(s) 3

b. Do the advisory council/committee(s) have representative numbers of women and men consistent with the area and programs served by the agency?

Yes 1 15

No 2

In some instances . . 3

c. Do the advisory council/committee(s) have representative numbers of racial and ethnic minority groups consistent with the area served by the agency?

Yes 1 16

No 2

In some instances . . 3

9. Rate the extent to which the agency utilizes the advisory committee(s).

High. Agency personnel utilize the advisory committee(s) extensively 1 17

Average. Agency personnel utilize the advisory committee(s) on a limited basis 2

Low. Agency personnel do not utilize the advisory committee(s) 3

10. Is the vocational program of the agency coordinated with programs sponsored under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and other public and private training programs offered in the area?

Yes. Agency personnel coordinate programs with outside agencies 1 18

Limited. Annual contact is made 2

No. Programs are not coordinated 3

11. Does the agency have a locally directed evaluation system?

Yes. A system exists which enables evaluation of the total vocational program 1 19

Under development. The development of a locally directed evaluation system is underway . . . 2

No. An organized system does not exist other than testing done by instructors or evaluation of staff members conducted by the administrators, etc. 3

12a. How would you rate the quality of the cooperative education program offering in the agency?

High. Training agreements and plans are in evidence and adequate time is allotted for supervision of students . . . 1 20

Average. A program exists but is only minimally serving the students enrolled 2

Low. Considerable revision is necessary to improve the present program offerings 3

A cooperative education program is not offered by the agency *(Skip to Q.14)* 4

b. If training agreements exist, do they contain a statement that assures nondiscrimination on the basis of sex, handicap, race and national origin?

Yes 1 21

No 2

In some instances . . 3

13. If a cooperative education program is offered, are students placed in training sites regardless of race, color, national origin, sex or handicap?

Yes 1 22

No 2

14. To what extent are vocational programs offered by the agency focusing on up-to-date occupational competencies?

Extensive. Programs are regularly reviewed and revised based on changes in job training needs 1 23

Moderate. Some programs in the agency are regularly reviewed and revised to better meet job training needs 2

Limited. Agency personnel do not review and revise programs on a regular basis 3

15. Indicate your perception of the degree of involvement the agency has had with the State Board-sponsored Career Guidance Center in the region.

High. Regular contact is evident	1	24
Moderate. Staff has attended one or more Career Guidance Center meetings during the past year	2	
Limited. Staff receives Center newsletters regularly	3	
No involvement evident	4	

16. To the best of your knowledge, indicate the Career Guidance Center services that the agency has utilized. *(Circle all that apply)*

Newsletters	1	25
In-service training	2	26
Resource materials	3	27
Placement assistance or information	4	28
Consultive services	5	29
Special assistance	6	30
None of the above	7	31

17. Do the vocational programs offered through the One and Five Year Plan for Vocational Education afford equal access for all students to all programs proposed by the agency thus assuring that no student will be denied access to such programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex or handicap?

Yes	1	32
No	2	

18a. Is there a policy statement prepared by the agency and approved by the Board of Control insuring equal educational opportunity regardless of race, color, national origin, sex or handicap?

Yes	1	33
No *(Skip to Q.19)*	2	

b. Has the policy been disseminated to staff with implications for performing job responsibilities?

Yes 1 34

No 2

c. Does evidence exist of staff compliance with the approved policy?

Yes 1 35

No 2

19. Does the agency provide public notification of its non-discriminatory practices?

Yes 1 36

No 2

20. Has any locally directed (self) evaluation been conducted by the agency to assess the existence and the possible extent of sex bias and sex role stereotyping in vocational programs?

Yes 1 37

No 2

21. Does the K-8 occupational information program offered by the agency address the issue of sex role stereotyping (i.e., sex fair language and materials, bulletin boards, etc.)?

Yes 1 38

No 2

The Agency does not offer a K-8
Occupational Information Program . . 3

22. Is sex fair language used by the agency in all publications related to vocational education (i.e., student handbook, Local Plan, course descriptions, etc.)?

Yes 1 39

No 2

23. Rate the extent to which guidance and vocational orientation activities in the agency are provided to students to encourage them to consider all programs of study, regardless of their sex.

High. The importance of non-biased career planning is stressed for both male and female students 1 40

Medium. Materials and resources utilized are generally sex fair but little time is spent in counteracting undue social pressures to conform 2

Limited. No effort is made 3

24. Is participation in agency ancillary services such as guidance and counseling, students organization, placement services, etc., open to all students regardless of race, color, national origin, sex or handicap?

Yes 1 41

No 2

25. Have staff of the agency (instructors, administrators, guidance personnel, etc.) received in-service trainings related to the elimination of discriminatory practices regarding race, color, national origin, sex, and handicap?

Yes 1 42

No 2

26. Which of the following groups have received in-service as an aid in exploring issues related to sex equity. *(Circle all that apply)*

Instructors 1 43

Administrators 2 44

Student services personnel 3 45

Cooperative education coordinators. . 4 46

Advisory council members 1 47

Board of control members 2 48

Parent groups 3 49

Community groups 4 50

None of the above 1 51

Coder ______________ 52-54

Keypunch ______________ 55-57

For Office Use Only 58-79/BK

80/1

EMPLOYER FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

____
Survey Number

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions and return this form in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope.

A. VOCATIONAL TRAINING EVALUATION

Please rate the vocational training received by the individual in each of the following areas: (✓)

	Very Good (1)	Good (2)	Neutral (3)	Poor (4)	Very Poor (5)
1. Technical Knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Work Attitude	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Work Quality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

B. OVERALL RATING

Check the overall rating of the vocational training received by this individual as it relates to the requirements of his or her job:

Very Good (1)	Good (2)	Neutral (3)	Poor (4)	Very Poor (5)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

C. RELATIVE PREPARATION

As a result of this person's vocational training, please rate his or her preparation in relation to other employees in the work group who did not receive such training: (✓)

☐ (1) Individual is better prepared
☐ (2) Individual is same as other employees
☐ (3) Individual is less prepared
☐ (4) No basis for comparison

D. COMMENTS:

THANK YOU FOR HELPING US. PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE.

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

____
Survey Number

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions and return this form in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope.

A. School Status (check only one box)

☐ 1. I am not in school.

☐ 2. I am in school taking classes to become a ______________________________.

B. Work Status (check only one box)

☐ 1. I am in the full-time military.

☐ 2. I have a job and I am not in the full-time military.

☐ 3. I am unemployed and looking for a job.

☐ 4. I am unemployed and not looking for a job.

NOTE: If you have a job or you are in the full-time military, please answer the following questions. If you are unemployed, stop here and return this follow-up form in the enclosed envelope.

C. Please provide the following information.

JOB TITLE, NAME OF JOB, OR MILITARY TITLE		NAME OF BOSS, SUPERVISOR OR IMMEDIATE COMMANDING OFFICER
DESCRIBE THE WORK THAT YOU DO		
NAME OF COMPANY WHERE YOU WORK OR MILITARY INSTALLATION WHERE YOU ARE STATIONED		
STREET ADDRESS		
CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE

D. Is the work that you do related to the vocational classes you had in school?

☐ 1. Yes, I am using my vocational training.

☐ 2. No, I am not using my vocational training.

E. How many hours do you work each week? (Do not include overtime) . . . . __________ hours per week

F. How much do you make per hour? (Do not include overtime pay) . . . . $__________ per hour

THANK YOU FOR HELPING US. PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE.

VITA

Juan C. Gonzalez was born on March 8, 1952 in Amarillo, Texas where he completed his elementary and secondary education. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, in 1974, where he majored in Latin American Studies. He earned his Masters of Arts degree in Bilingual-Bicultural Studies from the University of Texas at San Antonio at San Antonio, Texas in 1976. Currently he is a Title VII Bilingual Teacher Trainer Fellow at the University of Illinois, working toward his Ph.D. in Educational psychology.

He has had extensive experience in the evaluation of bilingual education programs and in testing of minority children. In addition, he has worked as a career counselor for minority students both in Texas and at the University of Illinois.